

U704  
M. 72.1  
1889

---

# PROPHETIC CONTROVERSY, No. 3;

OR THE

## EVEN BALANCES

BY WHICH

ISAAC SCOTT, CHANCY LOOMIS, AND THE FOUNDERS OF  
THE REORGANIZATION ARE WEIGHED AND  
FOUND WANTING.

IN TWO CHAPTERS.

BY WINGFIELD WATSON, AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY  
SAINTS, BAY SPRINGS, CHARLEVOIX, COUNTY, MICHIGAN,  
FEBRUARY, 1889.

---

# REFLECTIONS.

In the Priesthood as revealed through the prophet Joseph Smith, there are various degrees, each degree organized into quorums with each its president and counsellors, the quorum of *Deacons*, being the lowest; next the *Teachers*, next the *Priests* of the Aaronic order. Next comes the *Elders*, the lowest or least office in the Melchizedec Priesthood. Next the *High Priests*; next the *Twelve Apostles*; next the *Vice Presidents*, or Counsellors to the President, and next the *President*, *over the whole church, and over the whole priesthood*; who in virtue of his ordination under the hands of angels is a "prophet, seer, revelator, and translator, having all the gifts which God bestows upon the head of the church." This is the most superior degree of Priesthood known in the church in any age of the world, and his two counsellors, assistants, or vice-presidents, are next in degree of Priesthood below the President, but superior to the Twelve; and so from the Twelve down to the deacons, each quorum is less in degree, one below the other. Now as it has never been taught of God in any way, in any age, that any man, in any of these quorums, can ever get out of his quorum into a superior quorum or degree of the Priesthood unless he is called to it and ordained *by the superior*, the question may be fairly and justly asked, How did Brigham Young get, not only into the next degree of Priesthood above him, but into the second degree above him without either a call or an ordination

to either? The act in and of itself, proves him a base usurper, a rebel, and a traitor to God, and to his fellow man. But this criminality will appear much plainer, since God has said: "He that is ordained of me, shall come in at the gate, *and be ordained* as I have told you before." There is one gate into the church, which is repentance and baptism, and there is evidently another gate to the priesthood, and especially the highest degree of it; and that is a call to it by revelation direct from God; and remember that God is here speaking of the *highest degree* of the Priesthood; the office of prophet, seer, revelator, and translator to the church.

2. The leading Josephites sometimes talk so plainly upon the necessity of Joseph's successor being appointed by the Almighty through Joseph (see Herald, Aug. 18, 1888), one would really imagine that they had just such a revelation to put into the hands of every honest enquirer to satisfy him on that point. But all honest enquiry after any revelation from God through Joseph Smith appointing his son to succeed him, ends in "mud pie." There is no such revelation, reader, and never was.

3. The leaders of the Reorganization never tire ridiculing and abusing Brigham Young and his co-leaders for misleading, and the people for following them; but in the name of reason we ask who on earth could the people follow, or what could they

---

CONTINUED ON THIRD PAGE OF COVER.

# PROPHETIC CONTROVERSY, No. 3;

OR THE

## EVEN BALANCES

BY WHICH

ISAAC SCOTT, CHANCY LOOMIS, AND THE FOUNDERS OF  
THE REORGANIZATION ARE WEIGHED AND  
FOUND WANTING.

IN TWO CHAPTERS.

BY WINGFIELD WATSON, AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY  
SAINTS, BAY SPRINGS, CHARLEVOIX COUNTY, MICHIGAN.

### CHAPTER I.

There seems to be a most unusual disposition of late on the part of the reorganized Mormons to attack and defame the character of James J. Strang, and the works of his ministry. They have done this all along from time to time since 1860, through their organ, *The Saint's Herald*, but lately for some reason or other the defamations and slander of Mr. Strang through that paper has greatly exceeded itself. It must be that Strangite Mormons are making their principles known some how, and something must be done to counteract it; hence this unusual resort to slander, defamation and assassination of character, instead of taking the Law and the Testimony of God and his prophets, and being willing to stand or fall by its decision.

That Mr. I. F. Scott who has so highly distinguished himself as a mobber and a slanderer of God's anointed and his followers in Missouri, should still be found at his old business is not surprising. By the way how is it that the person who used to be Isaac Scott is now become Isaac F. Scott? Has he like some

others, ashamed of his former record, adopted a mask, in order that he may not be known? His efforts to account for the discovery of the Voree Record, as set forth in the Saint's Herald of Dec. 29, 1888, and his endeavor to pass off his own bare testimony of men now dead, who cannot answer for themselves, may be very sweet and pleasant to those who prefer slander to God's eternal truth—sectarian like,—and who dare not test their creed by the word of God; but those who stand upon that word, and test all things by it, neither fear Mr. Scott, nor regard his slanders. Being acquainted with the tactics and low cunning of all that class of men, who have opposed the faith of Jesus Christ from the very beginning of this dispensation, I must say that Mr. Scott's efforts to destroy the work of Mr. Strang and their works bear a very remarkable likeness. The numerous efforts made by such men as Scott to show how Joseph Smith deceived his witnesses, to palm a fraud on mankind "to make money out of it," are all so like his "rafting auger" story to account for the discovery of the Voree Record, we can-



not but think that it will do very well to class along with them. The story that "his disciples came and stole him away while we slept" is not a whit more childish, vile, nor self-convicting than this same rafting augur story. If Joseph Smith's whole life and ministry had not been interpreted and construed in a very similar manner as Mr. Scott has construed Mr. Strang's life and ministry, we might be surprised at this second "Spaulding story." But isn't it a little curious that it has been apostate Mormons who have furnished the materials for all the meanest stories written against Joseph Smith? Begin with the "Spaulding story" and trace this matter all the way up to the present time, and I think you will find that it was just such Mormons as Isaac Scott, that have furnished the warp and the woof of the most diabolical stories written all along against the Mormons, and Mormonism. I handed a Mormon tract to a Baptist preacher some time ago to read. "No," said he, "I want none of those things; when I want to know anything about the Mormons I consult Mr. Beadle's works." That is he consults the Mormons' meanest enemies when he wishes to learn anything about Mormons or Mormonism. Now what is the difference between this Baptist preacher and his orthodox brethren everywhere, and those Mormons who take the exclusive testimony of Mr. Strang's meanest enemy's against him?

Mr. Strang was either what he claimed to be; that is, Joseph Smith's lawfully appointed successor. ap-

pointed by revelation from God through Joseph, and ordained by angels as Joseph was, or else he was about as great a criminal as has stood on the earth in one thousand years at least. But how to believe that as honorable a man as James J. Strang was known to be in his former life, all at once, *when he became a Mormon*, turned to be just such a criminal and got down to the low tricks of forging ancient records, palming them upon his fellow man, and lying in the name of Almighty God "to make money" is something so mean and so cowardly in itself that we will have to leave all such beliefs to the Scotts and the Hullets and Howes, who seem to be incapable of having an exalted or even a reasonable opinion of their fellow men. Great heavens, have the leaders of the Reorganization got down at last upon a sectarian sand bank, that they dread the light, and have to resort to a refuge of lies to keep them from sinking? Right here we make the sweeping statement that whatever argument overthrows Mr. Strang's claims as a prophet of God, and the successor of Joseph Smith, will also overturn in like manner the claims of Joseph Smith; and if anyone doubts this he may undertake to test it as soon as he pleases.

Have you never considered, reader, how much James J. Strang resembled Joseph Smith *in his rascality* anyhow? Joseph was brought up some thirty-nine times before the different tribunals of his country, charged with all kinds of crimes—murder, treason, robbery, and out-

rages of all kinds, and it is said that he was honorably acquitted every time accept once for unlawful banking. James J. Strang was so often brought up before such tribunals on just such charges, that he said with the utmost stretch of memory, he could not remember the number of times, and he was honorably acquitted also *every time*. Their enemies *in both* cases say that their brethren swore them out; swore alibies, swore everything truth and falsehood, and procured their acquittal in this way. James was hunted in his ministry as with blood hounds, and a large reward offered for his head "dead or alive," as was Joseph Smith, and after years of unsuccessful effort to kill him, by law, the good people, of whom Mr. Isaac Scott is an example, who *knew* so well that he was an impostor, and deceiver, swore that as law would not reach him, powder and bullets would, and they did; precisely as they did in Joseph's case. You would scarcely think there was such a likeness in the characters of the two; but it is really a fact. Joseph's case was called "martyrdom and sealing his testimony with his blood;" but the whole circumstances and causes were all so nearly alike in both cases we often wonder that even spurious Mormons do not see the parallel. Poor benighted Strangites can account for it only on the ground that the same cause produces the same effect. "If the light that is in thee be darkness how great is that darkness." There is still another thing that puzzles, and I confess often makes me sad;—that is that while Mormons are every-

where crying out to the gentiles, that that the great mass of mankind were always ready to honor and revere the memory of dead prophets, they always persecuted, shamefully slandered, and often martyred the living ones immediately sent among them. Yet Joseph Smith was hardly cold in his clay when these very Mormons began to do these very things themselves; and while they had for years condemned the practice among Gentiles of resorting to foul slander as the best means to put down Mormonism, instead of trying to do it by the word of God, those were the very means resorted to by themselves, to prevent God almighty from fulfilling his word through Joseph!!

Now if there is any man anywhere to-day getting up another plausible and slick "Spaulding story" to answer the end intended by its predecessor, but who is at a loss to account for the many, or *any* of the wonders of Joseph's ministry, I would most earnestly recommend him to consult Mr. Isaac Scott and his confederates. If Scott especially can't furnish him with such means, he may as well consider his work a failure. Isaac has a most decided talent and turn for any business of that kind, I tell you. Would not some such theory by which he endeavors to account for the Voree plates be a very good way to account for the plates that "Ole Joe" showed to the eight witnesses?

Precisely like any other sectarian, who undertakes to attack Mormonism, Isaac does not seem to notice that while he is attacking Mr. Strang's claims and ministry he is



most effectually undermining or taking the underpinning from under his own faith: that is, if he has any. Supposing for instance that these three men as Scott says, did really forge that letter of appointment; we find in that letter some very remarkable prophecies; quite as much so as any ever uttered by Joseph Smith or anybody else; and so the question naturally arises here; if this trio of speculating knaves and scamps so called can foretell such remarkable things with such remarkable accuracy, with *their* peculiar inspiration, why could not Joseph Smith do the same, or similar things with just such inspiration: that is the low and and groveling spirit of money-making, by knavery and fraud? Just such a spirit as his enemies have all along accused him of possessing? One of these prophecies reads "my servant Joseph, thou hast been faithful over many things, and thy reward is glorious; the crown and scepter are thine, and they wait thee; but thou hast sinned in some things and thy punishment is very bitter."

To those who have read the account of Joseph's death, no further proof of the faithful fulfilment of this prediction is needed; and no one fact in relation to that letter is any clearer than that its contents were made public on the 9th day of July, 1844, the date claimed as the date of its reception. Joseph was indeed slain some 12 days before the alleged receipt of that letter; but in a day when there were no railroads from Nauvoo to Burlington, Wis., it necessarily took a tedious time to get a letter a distance of

some four hundred miles. And whatever else may be said of that letter, it cannot be denied that its contents were made public in Burlington Wis., before any news of Joseph Smith's death arrived in that place. Another prophecy, and now remember that Scott says that "Strang dictated every word of" that letter of appointment. (Herald page 832.) "Great calamities are coming on the church and *and such as have not been.*" Is there a believer in Mormonism to-day endowed with a reasonable share of common sense, who is prepared to dispute the fulfillment of this prediction? There is not a Mormon on earth that can successfully do it, and in point of veracity, and extent of complications, it is fully equal to anything foretold by Joseph Smith at any time in his ministry. First of all it was a very sad calamity that Joseph and Hyrum should be slain. Second, it was the saddest of all calamities that Brigham Young should have gotten the lead over the church, and they be thus led to destruction. Third, the rejection of the church at Nauvoo *with their dead*, after all their sacrifice and toil, was an exceedingly sad and sore calamity. Fourth, the loss of the temple, costing in the neighborhood of a million dollars, was a most sad calamity. Fifth, the loss of at least two thousand people by want, exposure, and destitution, was a terribly sad and great calamity. Sixth, the demand made upon them of 500 of their best men to fight in Mexico, at a time when of all times their services were most needed in their own ranks, was no

very small calamity. Seventh, the immense sacrifice of property of all kinds accumulated in Nauvoo and other settlements. Eighth, the millions sacrificed in transporting the people across the Rocky Mountains, and the millions expended and constantly necessary to keep up an irrigating system to produce the necessities of life, in a salt and barren land, all of which might easily have been avoided and applied to the spreading of the gospel, are also among the greatest and most unusual calamities. Tenth, the Edmunds law since its operation must have taken considerably over a million dollars in money and value out of them in fines and confiscations. All these are *great* calamities and such as the church theretofore had not experienced; but *the end is not yet*. Add to these things the darkness, the disorder, the scattering, the doubt, the confusion, and the indifference, that have come over many thousands and at the very least, the hundreds of thousands who would have been in the church to-day but who are not, all of which are clearly tracable to the usurpations of Brigham Young and his fellows, and we have a series of great and most unusual calamities. Calamities which no living Mormon can contemplate without being driven to sadness, and almost to despair for the final success and triumph of this dispensation. And I tell you plainly that if it were not for the precious promises made in these our own days, both through Joseph and James, of the final triumph of this dispensation, and the casting

down of all usurpers by one mighty and strong as Moses, whom God is to send, I would have been driven to hopeless despair long ago.

You may, gentlemen of the reorganized church, and of the Brighamite party, hold up the revelation on the rebellion of South Carolina, and the war that followed as indisputable evidence of the inspiration of Joseph Smith, as indeed it is, but what say you to the above prediction?

As the slanderers of Joseph Smith have made "Solomon Spaulding" according to their view of things, the ablest man that has ever stood upon the earth, since the days of Adam; are you prepared to make of James J. Strang a very similar person by attributing this and many other predictions to mere human wisdom? And if so, how will you get rid of the conclusion that Joseph Smith and all other prophets uttered all their prophecies by mere human wisdom? and that the only "keys" they held were the greed of gain and money-making?"

Let us look at another prophecy of this letter. "The faith which thou (James J. Strang) hast had in the shepherd and stone of Israel, hath been repaid to thee a thousand fold and *and thou shalt be like him.*" As it has taken many old Mormons long and many years to learn that Joseph Smith was the modern "shepherd and stone of Israel," how did it happen that James J. Strang who had not yet seen a copy of the Doctrine & Covenants, a mere child in Mormonism, a babe in the faith, found that out? How did he find out by the

knavery which Mr. Scott attributes to him, that Joseph was the "shepherd and stone" of these latter days? "And thou shalt be *like him*." Ah! that implies a great deal more than the letter of appointment and a mere claim to angelic ordination. How could Mr. Strang or any one else be like Joseph as a prophet, unless he should not only claim an appointment by revelation, and angelic ordination to the highest order of the Melchizedec priesthood, but in entering also upon just such a work as Joseph had merely begun? That is, the bringing forth and the translation of ancient and sacred records, by the gift and power of God, by Urim and Thummim as well as the giving of other revelations for the guidance of his ministers and the regulation of the church, just as Joseph did? Teaching the same order of the two priesthoods, and the same duties of members, and officers and quorums? The same baptism for the dead, with its most solemn teachings and necessity. The same temple building, tithing, baptism, confirmation, blessing of infants; giving line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little in proportion as needed and required and as the capacity of the people demanded? And as the same causes produces like effects, how should James or anybody else be like Joseph, unless he should be hounded and slandered and defamed to the lowest hell by fallen and corrupt Mormons, and thereby be arraigned before courts and tribunals upon the charges of all kinds of crime, and honorably acquitted

every time, and then finally be martyred as Joseph was? And did not all these things happen to him as they happened to Joseph? And in which of these things was he lacking? As Joseph's works fitted into and harmonized with the former prophets, so James' works and Joseph's works run together and harmonize like water from a crystal fountain, or the timbers of a vast building fitly framed by two master workmen.

Test the one as you test the other, and when you find one of James' timbers too large or too small in tenons or mortise to fit into Joseph's framing, cry out against him.

When I say test them; I don't mean to test their mere conversation; the thousand and one "he told mes," and "I heard him says," that are liable in being bandied about from mouth to mouth to be altered and changed in meaning and form. I mean test their written revelations and their written testimonies concerning them, and see if they will not agree, one with the other. In fine could he be like Joseph unless his whole prophetic life and ministry had been counted one continued round of fraud and crime "to make money" just as it was with Joseph himself?

John E. Page once asked, at a time when if he ever was in his right mind it was then: "In heavens name if Mr. Strang was not appointed by revelation through Joseph according to that letter, and according to the law of God who *did* Joseph appoint?" That question is still unanswered, though it is so abundantly



evident from God's law laid down through Joseph that God would appoint one by revelation through him to succeed him. John E. went on to state that if there was no revelation given through Joseph to appoint one in his stead, that Joseph had then proved himself a false prophet, and Mormonism had fallen to the ground.

Any one who will thoroughly look at the following passages, must know that Joseph Smith merely *opened* this dispensation, and that there is a vast amount to come forth in this dispensation in the shape of records and to be translated into our language. Joseph says:—"For it is necessary in the ushering in of the dispensation of the fullness of times, which dispensation is now (1842) *beginning* to usher in, that a *whole* and *complete* and *perfect* union, and *welding together of dispensations* and keys and powers, and glories should take place and be revealed from the *days of Adam even to the present time*; and not only this, but that those things which never have been revealed from the foundation of the world, but have been kept hid from the wise and prudent, shall be revealed unto babes and sucklings in this the dispensation of the fullness of times." (See his second letter on baptism for the dead par. 18.) "Wherefore the things of *all* nations shall be made known, \* \* \* and there is nothing which is *sealed* upon the earth save it shall be loosed. Wherefore all things which *have been revealed unto the children of men* shall at that day (this present genera-

tion) be revealed." (See chap. 12, 2d book of Nephi, last par.)

"And he shall send Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you, whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution (or restoring) of *all things spoken by the mouths of all the holy prophets since the world began.*" (Acts 3, 20, 21.)

These most precious scriptures give us an idea of the vast that is to come forth in this dispensation which Joseph a little before his death has told us had only *begun* in his work. These things are called the oracles of God or the sealed mysteries and revelations. Joseph held the keys of these mysteries "until I (God) shall appoint unto them (the church) another in his stead." Again God says to him, "nevertheless through you (by revelation) shall (these) oracles be given to another, even unto the church." Accordingly James J. Strang was appointed by revelation from God through Joseph to stand in Joseph's stead to enter upon this work, and accordingly he did enter upon and *did* bring many of these things to light according to the faithfulness of the people. And now if James J. Strang has not done anything of this sort, and was *never* appointed, then there is absolutely no evidence that any one *has* been so appointed, for no one else has brought a line or a sentence of these precious things forth and has never even hinted at that matter. Nor has anyone ever presented a line of revelation through Joseph as an appointment to succeed him, which is the great key to this whole work. "There

fore," says James, "there is no escaping the conclusion that either I am a true prophet, and his lawful successor, or Joseph is a false prophet, and Mormonism an imposture." So we see from all these things what a vast there is to come forth in these days. And as they are all written upon material that cannot be corroded or dimmed, or destroyed by time, there are yet many things to come forth on metallic plates that will need to be slandered and defamed by a high priest after the order of the son of perdition, and therefore Mr. Isaac Scott, or some one to take his lineal priesthood, cannot well be spared yet a while.

We will now enter upon other ground. From a revelation given to James in 1849, Jan. 7, we quote: "And now turn unto me all ye my people lest the disobedient and rebellious be cut off, and cast out of his possessions, and *persecution and wrath* come upon those who are slack in serving me, and I give you *chastisement*, and *much sorrow*. For your *enemies shall be upon you*, and *ye shall flee before them*, if ye turn not unto me to be faithful."

Now I am quite willing to leave this matter to those who have been driven from the Islands, to say whether these things have been fulfilled upon them or not; whether they have remained true to God under James or turned away from him. Again we quote from the same revelation, pp. 4 and 5: "Moreover I have given you the Islands of the Great Lakes for a possession. There shall ye dwell apart

from the Gentiles, and none shall make you afraid. For my law shall be kept there, and judgment shall be rendered against those that despise it. *If ye will therefore possess these things, remember my law to keep it.* Forget not the precepts which I have given you, but act wisely according to the (word of) wisdom which I have given you, and despise not my word for it is not a vain thing. I have given you *wisdom with promise*. *If ye will not regard to live by it, the promise is not unto you.*"

I notice that the Isaac Scotts and the Chauncy Loomises, and a host of other fair weather friends and Job's Comforters, in their denunciations of things they understand not, have seemingly got it into their heads that if James J. Strang were only a prophet of God, the people under him must and ought to prosper greatly, whether they act wisely or foolishly, disobediently or obediently, whether tobacco juice is constantly oozing from their lips and streaming down their chins or not; whether their nerves are all unstrung by enervating and stimulating, hot, and injurious drinks or not; whether in mid-summer pure hog's grease oozed from the pores of their skin or did not; whether they had jarrings, bickerings, lawsuits, or backbitings and complainings, or did not have them; no matter; they must prosper under a prophet of God anyway. They may tell us that James said this and that about their never being driven from there. But neither in the Law brought forth by James, nor Joseph, nor by Moses, nor by any other

prophet since the world began can they find any such promise. Not one. It is plainly written in both the law of God, and the revelations of James that our remaining on the Islands or anywhere else, where the saints are called, is on condition of obedience, and is not assured on any other ground. "Your vineyards, your gardens and your orchards ye shall plant again, and they shall flourish, and ye shall eat the fruit thereof; ye shall build houses and shall inhabit them; and children's children shall be in them for a crown of glory to you, *if ye remember the Lord your God, whose name is great and glorious, and keep his statutes.*" And again in another place we read that we shall read the law in the voice of mourning when we have sinned against God, and have fled before our enemies. (See Book of the Law, page 206, par. 12; 207, par. 17.) Those who kept the commandments of God and his law and the Word of Wisdom and tried to have others do so, are witnesses that prosperity, peace, and prevailing against the enemy, were realized and that for years they enjoyed those blessings and promises on the Islands. But they noticed also that in the last year of their dwelling there, backbiting, bickerings, law-suits, jealousy, jarrings, and want of devotion and prayer in families, began to steal in among them, and in proportion as these things gained ground, the enemy began to steal in and gain ground also,—precisely as it has been in Missouri, and in many other places where there has been a gathering of

saints, in times of old, as in these days. The Book of Mormon has many such examples of this kind written in it for our learning. So it has been, and so it will ever be in the gathering places of the saints; there *must be righteousness there*, or there is no assurance of permanent residence or prosperity there; that is all. And even at the final ingathering of all the saints no more to be thrown down, God says, "Nevertheless if they pollute their inheritances they *shall* (even then) be thrown down, for *I will not spare them* if they pollute their inheritances." These things are a full answer to the question, Why is Voree left desolate? And Nauvoo and Kirtland and Independence and all other places where Saints were called? We are Latter Day Israel, and God has dealt with us as he did with former day Israel. No difference. And though the Shimeis and the Scotts and the Loomises cast stones at, and curse us, let them beware what they are doing, for these places will all be built up, and every promise that God has made in relation to them will all be fulfilled; and those who have reviled the prophet James and the work he has done, will be brought to shame, and the contempt of mankind. For let me tell them that there is any amount more in Strangism so called, than its revilers and persecutors have ever thought of; and in a day when they least expect it, this truth will burst upon them with a glory that will cause dismay in their ranks. It seems the lessons of the of the past are written to them to no



very great profit. We quote once more from the above revelation, and will let that for the present suffice.

"They that speak evil of him (James) are enemies unto me, saith the Lord. They have given themselves unto LIES and THEIR HEARTS TO WICKEDNESS. For he is meeker than Moses and more patient than Job." Who can resist the truth contained here? Now take that class of men who have distinguished themselves most in defaming Mr. Strang, and the works he has done, and just look over their career, and where do we find them?

Take the Brighamite leaders to begin with, who have first of all spoken evil of Mr. Strang and cut him off(?) from the church without a hearing; if they have not gotten up a "refuge of lies" and wickedness to sustain themselves in power and to lead the church, then we boldly assert that a refuge of lies for that purpose has never been invented since the world began. In this refuge the twelve literally abolished two of the most important quorums of officers in the church as Joseph left it, for in putting themselves at the head they not only put *twelve* heads all of which were of equal power one with the other, over the church, but in doing so they abolish their own quorum and that of the First Presidency also, which was the most important quorum in the whole church. Taking their own word for it, they thus put twelve prophets, seers, revelators and translators over the church, all of equal power, gifts, keys and priesthood, where God designed but one, and made no provision in his law

only for one. We need only say that all the arguments, efforts and craft used to accomplish this were all simply the basest of lies and wickedness. It was never done only by the grossest perversions and falsifications of God's law. Now take William E. McClellan, Aaron Smith, John E. Page, John C. Gaylord, William Smith, Josiah Ells, William Marks, James Blakesly, Charles B. Thompson, Isaac Scott and others, all of whom have distinguished themselves as defamers of James J. Strang, and where does history find *them*? Great heavens, what a history! Simply a constant running out of one diabolical delusion into another all the way. Brewsterism, Baneemyism, McClellanism, Brighamism, William Smithism, David Whitmerism, and even Spiritualism! If the spreading of darkness and doubt and uncertainty among saints is the delight of Satan and his host, the works and doings of this class of men must have afforded him, and his, a real feast. The amount of evil they have accomplished against God and against man is not in the power of man to estimate, and will never be fully known in this life. If all of these have not "given themselves to lies, and their hearts to wickedness where in heaven's name will you find an example? O ye rebels, ye slanderers and defamers of Gods anointed; is it any wonder that Voree, and the islands of the great Lakes are desolate? Is it any wonder that *all* the gathering places of Zion are a desolation, and the inhabitants thereof sighing, and strangers and wanderers among the

nations? Is it any wonder that God has hidden his face and "covered" or hidden "the seers, and the prophets"? For it is written "when the wicked rise a man (that is a man of God) is hidden." How true it is that these men have "only accomplished to scatter and their evil ways follow them!" And *they* "don't remember, any prophecy that James J. Strang ever uttered has been fulfilled!!!" Whose fault is it if they do not? There are a great many good things which they don't see, and *can't* see, as well as that. Proof positive that there is no light abiding in them.

We will now examine another class of Mr. Strang's defamers, and see whether the foundation upon which their Reorganization so called is built is not another refuge of lies and wickedness, even greater than that of the Brighamites! For bad and grossly wicked as Brighamism is, its leaders have never gone down so far as to assert that the Aaronic priesthood, which the angel of God has so plainly told us, "could not," and "had not the power to lay on hands for even the gift of the Holy spirit," did actually lay on hands, and conferred the very highest order of the priesthood after the order of the son of God, and that God actually commanded men holding only that priesthood to lay on hands to confer this very priesthood; in other words commanded an order of priesthood to do that which he had already informed us it had no power to do! Yet this is the corner stone of the Reorganization. We most emphatically pronounce this lie No 1.

For the accomodation of all those who have not the works to refer to, we will insert the teachings of the Reorganization Leaders though they will enlarge this tract more than we desire.

To begin this search or examination, there is one thing that we must carry along with us, and not at any time for one moment forget it. If we forget this there is no end to the difficulties that we will be led into. What is it? Simply this: "The President of the church \* \* \* *is appointed by revelation.*" (Doc. and Cov. Sec. 99, 6.) What is revelation as here mentioned? The direct word of God. We have some one hundred and eight revelations of this kind in the Doctrine and Covenants, and therefore we ought to know what revelation means. Having this much straight and plain, we will next enquire *who* this revelation is to be given through? The answer comes like a whirlwind dashing down the revelations of all others in its course, saying, "Verily verily I say unto you, that *none else* shall be appointed unto *this gift* (the gift of prophet, seer, revelator and translator) *except it be through him,* (Joseph) \* \* \* and this shall be a law unto you, that ye receive not the teachings of any that shall come before you as revelations and commandments; and this I give unto you that ye may not be deceived; that you may *know* they (the revelations of any others and of all others) are not of me." (Doc. and Cov. Sec. 43, 2.)

Here then we have two complete rules; 1st, that the highest officer in



the church, the prophet, seer, revelator and translator to the church is appointed by revelation, or the direct word of God; and 2d, this revelation must come through the prophet Joseph and if any one comes along with any revelation through any one else for that purpose, God's law requires us to reject all such revelations forthwith.

With this bright lamp in our hands, we will proceed to examine the claims of the Reorganization as to whether young Joseph whom they have set up as Joseph's successor has received a legal call through the proper person. Being familiar with Reorganization history, having read it over and over many times in the last quarter of a century, what do you imagine we have found? Well, we have found two or three revelations appointing or pointing out young Joseph as his father's successor in the prophetic office. Through whom have they been given? Through Joseph his father? O no, nothing of that kind. I find one of these revelations has been given through Jason W. Briggs, and another through Zenos H. Gurley and another through young Joseph. Here is Jason's: "And in my own due time I *will* call upon the seed of Joseph Smith, and I will bring one forth, and he shall be mighty and strong, and he shall preside over the High Priesthood of my church." Not a very definite revelation certainly, as it merely points out the family, not the person. It is uncertain as well as unlawful, (see page 578 of Life of Joseph The Prophet.) Below

is Gurley's: Zenos H. Gurley says that about ten days after hearing of this Briggs revelation, he requested some others to join with him in asking the Lord who the successor of Joseph was, and says:—"We spent a few moments in prayer, when the Holy spirit said 'the successor of Joseph Smith is Joseph the son of Joseph Smith the prophet. It is his right by lineage, saith the Lord your God.'"

As these two revelations are simply unauthorized, not being given through the prophet Joseph, we reject them forthwith, and count them lies No. 2, and 3.

Below I will give a few extracts gathered from young Joseph's history, as given by himself to show his utter ignorance and unconsciousness of any calls by revelation through his father, or in fact through anybody else, from his father's death in 1844 up to the year 1860. Indeed so far as any word of the Lord through his father, pointing to him as his successor is concerned, he nor any one else has ever been able to produce a line of any such revelation. He says: "I did not then (1856) know *whether I should ever be called*, to take any part in that work"—Mormonism—"but that *if I were*, I was ready, and that it would have to be *made clear to me* IN PERSON, as well as to others. what that work was. That I could not move on the evidence of others only." (Life of Joseph The Prophet page 768.)

He says again, "In the fall of this (1856) *three events occurred* that had much to do with my course religious-



ly, and aiding me to decide the question. *What part of my father's work if any I was to take.*" (Page 760.)

Again: "While weighing my desires and capabilities for this work the question came up, '*will I ever have anything to do with Mormonism? If so, How, and what will it be?*' While engaged in this contemplation and perplexed with these *recurring* questions, the room suddenly expanded and passed away," etc. (page 757.) Once more: "I believed that He who enabled my father to decide" etc., etc., "*could enable me if he would to decide whether I should, or should not have anything to do with Mormonism: and if so what?*" (762). Again, "During the year 1859, the question of my connection with my father's work was *finally determined*. The queries heretofore referred to, were one by one being settled; until the final one *where and with whom* should my life labor lie? was the only one left." This last question he tells us was settled not by bringing up any revelation from God through his father, but by a revelation to himself, which he says had been given to others before in a similar way. (page 772.) Now, according to the law laid down to us which requires us to reject all revelations pointing out any one to succeed Joseph except the one that comes through Joseph the seer, we not only reject and spurn these revelations, but will go much further and testify that whosoever bases his faith on these revelations' or any one of them will be rejected at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, if he persists in it

after being faithfully warned against it; for God has sworn it. I have italicized those words of Joseph to faithfully draw the attention of all who read them, to the complete ignorance of young Joseph all along, of any call from God to him through his father. His is not the language of one called of God according to the pattern. Men called of God to so important an office as Joseph Smith the prophet held, are not left 16 years groveling and groping in his own thoughts in the effort to ascertain the certainty of that call. Ah no! Where will you find a parallel to young Joseph's blindness in all the appointments on record? It did not take little eight year old Samuel very long to find out his calling. God does not leave his prophets in any such darkness, doubt, and uncertainty. Not only is there no word of God produced in behalf of young Joseph through his father, but it has never been mentioned, referred to, or hinted at during the whole founding or building of the Reorganization; and for the very best of reasons, there was none to be had.

But this is not the worst feature about it; it was not only not hinted at, but its necessity is absolutely denied. See the following:

"Joseph Smith was taken away, dying a martyr, of which death he was conscious, and made preparation before it occurred. He was not accused by the Lord of transgression, and the gift that had been conferred upon him taken from him; ~~nor~~ *nor was there a command given him to appoint another in his stead, because he had*

been unworthy, and the Lord proposed to depose him from his office. *It was only in the event of the gift being taken from him, that he was to so appoint another.* 'THIS EVENT DID NOT OCCUR.' The above is a plain outspoken, absolute denial that God through Joseph appointed any one to stand in Joseph's stead by revelation! This is genuine unmitigated Brighamism; and therefore as Brigham said, "LET NO MAN PRESUME FOR A MOMENT THAT JOSEPH'S PLACE WILL BE FILLED BY ANOTHER; for remember he stands in his own place and always will," etc. So teach the heads of the Reorganization. The conclusion one should naturally arrive at from these words is simply this:—that in case Joseph Smith should fall so far from the favor of God as to lose his prophetic gift and office, and become a castaway we might then look for the Almighty with certainty to appoint a successor by revelation through Joseph, to lead the church, and prevent them from being deceived and led by false prophets and teachers; but in case that God should take Joseph away as he took Moses, Jesus, Elijah, Peter, James, and John in full possession of his prophetic gifts and priesthood, we are then in that case to have no one appointed to lead us and may make up our minds to get along without any one appointed by him to lead the church and the revelations of any body and everybody or nobody at all as the case might be, would be perfectly safe to follow. No one need then be under any alarm or apprehension of being deceived!! This is

the reason I suppose that it is so perfectly safe to take Jason W. Briggs Zenos H. Gurley and young Joseph Smith's revelations, and those of various others in the Reorganization, instead of looking to that of Joseph the prophet and seer for the appointment of a prophet. Is not the above statement of W. W. Blair and Brigham Young rich in the wisdom and knowledge of God? What a precious assurance and guarantee we have against being deceived after all! In case Joseph falls and becomes a castaway, we shall have one appointed of God through him to succeed him, and to lead us into everlasting life; but in case Joseph is sealed up unto everlasting life at God's right hand forever more, we may as well make up our minds to follow Andrew Jackson Davis's revelations as any one else. Having no prophet to guide us, we may as well have one man's revelations as another, or no revelations at all just as we pleased! If Joseph falls, then we can have a prophet of God; if he does not fall then we *can make one*, Brigham Young like for ourselves. If Joseph falls, then we can have all the dispensations of the past revealed unto us, all blending and harmonizing into one grand dispensation called "the dispensation of the fullness of time;" if he does not fall, then we can have Roman Catholicism repeated by putting up another Constantine over us and then shroud the earth in thick darkness and human counsels and wisdom for another long and dreary and dreadful period. So here is lie No. 5. Leaving entirely aside the revela-



tion in the letter of appointment, and following the diabolical teachings of Brigham Young and W. W. Blair and their associates, that as Joseph did not fall, and become a castaway, there was therefore no one appointed through Joseph, who can tell then who to follow as a teacher? Who can tell whether Brigham or Joseph or David Whitmer or any one else of the score or more of upstarts and claimants as leaders was the true one? As Joseph was the *only person* through whom a revelation of appointment could *lawfully* come, if he gave no such revelation, then we have absolutely no key by which to unlock and settle the question as to who *is* or *is not* the lawfull leader of the church. And all efforts, and all arguments, and plans, and theories to establish any man's claims to such leadership without such a revelation, are only the merest blinding and bewildering delusions. Get around, under, or over it, if you can.

Now what grounds had Brigham Young, or W. W. Blair or any body else to assert that it was only in the event of Joseph falling and losing his prophetic gift and office he should appoint one by revelation to succeed him? We answer, *none* absolutely. And when they said so, they said it in spite, and defiance, of one of the plainest decrees and promises of God, as follows: "Verily I say unto you (Joseph) the keys of this kingdom shall *never* be taken from you *while thou art in this world, neither in the world to come*; NEVERTHELESS THROUGH YOU shall the oracles (the sealed revelations of the past) be

given to another, yea even unto the church." (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 87, 2.)

That the "*oracles*" mean hidden or sealed revelations of the past is very clear from the following: "For I have given unto him (Joseph) the keys of the mysteries and the revelations which are sealed, until I shall appoint unto them (the church) another in his stead." (Sec. 27; 2. Sec. 107; 39.)

In the first of these two quotations we have the the promise of God sealing up Joseph to everlasting life, *with his priesthood "nevertheless"* as he had in his life merely begun this present dispensation, in bringing forth *some* of the sealed records of the past, another, *through him* is to be appointed to this work. This language is unmistakable; and gives the lie very pointedly to all those who say that "it was only in the event" of his losing his prophetic gift and office, he should "appoint another by revelation from God:" and taken in connection with other things we have the glorious promise that whether Joseph fell or was sealed up to everlasting life we are to have one appointed by direct revelation through him. For in another place God expressly promises him that in case he abided in him, he alone should stand at the head of this dispensation, and not only bring forth all the sealed records of the past, but all other things to be revealed up to the coming of Christ. And the very fact that Joseph was taken away in the *very infancy* of this dispensation, shows that Joseph *did something* that rendered



him unworthy to accomplish that great work, hence the propriety of that saying in the letter of appointment, "The crown and sceptre are thine and they wait thee; but thou hast sinned in *some* things," etc. Sinned, not in a degree either to deprive him of eternal life or his priesthood; but, like Moses who sinned in some manner sufficient to deprive him of the privilege of entering the promised land, he *did* something to cut him off from the glorious privilege of standing on the earth as God's only revelator up till the time of his coming.

Having fully shown that the Reorganization has succeeded in setting up young Joseph over them as his father's successor without a shadow of the word of God through his father appointing him to any such office, denying even its necessity, *this alone* would be a sufficient guarantee, that he never received a legal ordination; but for the sake of our readers who may know nothing about these things we will turn over a few leaves more and see how that matter stands.

First of all according to Reorganization history we are told that young Joseph was ordained a prophet, seer, revelator, and translator, and successor to his father under the hands of "William Marks, Zenos H. Gurley and others," on the 6th day of April 1860! So far as this is concerned, it is enough to say that, if "William Marks, Zenos H. Gurley, and those others" were vested with the keys, gifts, and priesthood of the prophetic office, like unto Moses, it is only reasonable to conclude that

"William Marks, Zenos H. Gurley and others," were prophets, seers, revelators, and translators, like unto Moses themselves. But on the contrary if they were in possession of no such gifts, keys, priesthood, and authority as Joseph Smith and Moses held, but were a set of men running about the country for 16 years, out of one delusion into another according to their own story, then they made young Joseph just such a prophet, seer, revelator and translator, like unto Moses as they were themselves. "Just this and nothing more." Only think of five or six prophets, seers, revelators and translators "like unto Moses having all the gifts which God bestows on the head of the church," running around for years after Brighamism, William Smithism, Baneemyism, and Strangism (which latter they tell us was a delusion also very great and wicked) and then going to work and ordaining another to be just like themselves, to keep them from being deluded any longer!!

Just think also of five or six prophets, seers, revelators, and translators like unto Moses existing all at one time, while the order of God does not make provision only for one. These men may say that Marks, Gurley and others "never claimed to be prophets, seers, and revelators as here stated." No not in so many words, but from what is written, and from the practice in all ages under God's prophets, and ministers it is very plain that no one can ordain to any priesthood that he does not hold himself; and that one must at least

hold the office to which he ordains another. We know very well that they did not hold any such office as they undertook to confer upon young Joseph, by the laying on of their hands and treat with utter scorn the idea that any such men did, or ever can confer such a priesthood. We only naturally concluded that if that set of men could make young Joseph or anybody else such a prophet as it was claimed he was made at that conference, that the ordainers were, and must be fully as great prophets as he. Why not? Of course you do not claim they were any such prophets, but much less, and in order to justify the lesser, *ordaining the greater*, you have claimed that the priesthood of Aaron which the Almighty in various places has told us has "no power to lay on hands for the gift of the Holy Spirit," did nevertheless lay on hands not only to confer the Holy Ghost, but actually that the very *highest* order of the Melchizedec Priesthood was conferred by it. This justification is set forth by you as follows: "Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery were ordained to the lesser priesthood by an angel (that is John the Baptist) then by *this authority*, and a commandment, they on the 6th day of April, 1830 ordained each other Elders, and the Eldership ordained High Priest, and apostles and this High priesthood ordained by a *commandment*, the president of the high priesthood, the *highest office* in the church; so that the alleged lesser ordaining the greater is common to both the first organization and the Reorganization

alike." (Life of Joseph The Prophet page 601.)

Old Joseph in setting forth his ordination under John the Baptist, says: "He (John) said that this priesthood had *not the power of laying on hands* for the gift of the Holy Ghost, but that this power should be conferred upon us *hereafter*; and he commanded us to go and be baptised and gave us directions that I should baptise Oliver Cowdery, and afterwards that he should baptise me," \* \* \* The messenger who visited us on this occasion, and conferred this priesthood upon us said that his name was John, the same that is called John the Baptist in the New Testament, and that he acted under the direction of Peter, James, and John who held the keys of the priesthood of Melchizedec, which priesthood he said should be conferred upon us *in due time*, and that I should be called the first elder and he (Oliver) the second." Months pass away in translating the Book of Mormon. etc. And Joseph says again: "We now became anxious to have that promise *realized* to us which the angel which conferred upon us the Aaronic priesthood had given us, viz. that provided we *continued faithful*, we should *also* have the Melchizedec priesthood, which holds the authority of the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. We had for some time made this a subject of *humble prayer*, and at length we got together in the chamber of Mr. Whitmer's house, in order more particularly to seek of the Lord what we now so earnestly desired: and here to our



*unspeakable satisfaction did we realize the truth of the Saviour's promise 'ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you.'*" And the voice of God again commanded them to ordain each other to the Melchizedec priesthood, as they were before commanded to ordain each other to the Aaronic priesthood.

Notwithstanding all this, and the further fact that, God has told us that he first sent the angel John the Baptist to confer upon Joseph and Oliver the Aaronic priesthood, and again that he had "*sent unto*" them Peter, James and John to confer the Melchizedec priesthood which they held in their day, the Reorganized leaders assert that Joseph and Oliver never received any angelic ordination only under the hands of John the Baptist! That Joseph and Oliver were commanded of God to ordain each other to the Melchizedec priesthood while as yet they had only the Aaronic, and were informed of God before that that priesthood "*had not the power to lay on hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost!*" Lie No. 6.

Thus the Almighty is accused of commanding men to do that which he told them several times they had no power to do, and could not do. (Times & Seasons, vol. 3. page 866 and 915, Doc. & Cov. Sec. 26, 1, 2.)

"And also with Peter, James, and John (angels) whom I have "*SENT UNTO you, by whom I have ordained you and confirmed you to be apostles, and especial witnesses,*" etc. According to the Reorganized leaders it was very essential that John the Baptist

should lay on hands to confer the lesser priesthood; but it was unnecessary that those holding the Melchizedec, which is by far the greater of the two priestoods, should lay on hands to confer that priesthood. The simple omission to mention particularly that the hands of Peter, James, and John, were laid on in the act of ordaining Joseph and Oliver to the Melchizedec priesthood, is taken as positive proof that they were not laid on. But God in speaking of having sent John the Baptist to ordain them does not tell us that he confessed his priesthood by the putting on of his hands; so we should naturally conclude, from their view and teachings, that the hands of neither John the Baptist, nor Peter, James, and John, were laid on to ordain to either priesthood. But the whole idea of obtaining or conferring priesthood without the laying on of hands of those who hold it, is so ridiculous that even sectarians, foolish as their notions are concerning priesthood, would revolt at it. To put this matter at rest, it is sufficient to say that there is no instance on record of any order of priesthood or any office in either of the two priesthoods being ever obtained or conferred, only under the hands and voice of those who hold them. Moreover God has informed us that the Aaronic priesthood is merely an *appendage* to the greater or Melchizedec priesthood; but the Reorganization reverses this, and makes the greater or Melchizedec priesthood only an appendage or something that is wholly derived from the lesser. Is



it not an interesting idea that the great and glorious priesthood after the order of the son of God in which is contained all power, all gifts, all keys, all glory, perfection, knowledge and intelligence, is all derived from the Aaronic priesthood, which "has not power to lay on hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost," to confirm even a baptised person as a member in the church? O, is not the Reorganization a jewel? How different from Paul who has informed us that "perfection does not come by the Levitical priesthood." And from Joseph Smith who by revelation tells us that "The power and authority of the (highest degree of the) Melchizedec priesthood, is to hold the keys of *all* the spiritual blessings of the church, and of receiving the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 104; 9.) Without this highest degree of the Melchizedec priesthood and the ordinances thereof the power of godliness is not known. And is all of this derived from an order of the priesthood that has no power to lay on hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost? (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 83; 3.)

There are thousands of ordinations spoken of everywhere throughout the history of the church, of men to both priesthoods, where it is omitted to mention that the hands of the ordainers were laid on. Are we therefore to conclude that in none of these cases the hands of the ordainers were laid on? Why argue a thing that is so well known? For in the history of the church as often as we find an account of an ordination, so often we take it as a matter of course that, not

only were the hands of the ordainer laid on to confer the priesthood, but take it for granted also that, the ordainer held *at least* the office to which he ordained. So thoroughly and universally is this known to be the rule in the church of God, in all ages that it is deemed a clear act of usurpation, or the act of a hare brained fool or madman to undertake to disregard it. The priesthood after the order of the son of God may very aptly be compared to a mighty tree with its mighty limbs and branches, of which God is the root; and the Melchizedec priesthood, or the priesthood after the order of the son of God with its apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, may well represent the stem and the larger limbs of that tree, while the smaller limbs represent the Aaronic priesthood in its various offices; while the still lesser branches represent the members. Now to argue that this great priesthood of the son of God, from which all other officers great and small are derived, was derived from the Aaronic priesthood, is to argue that the tree was derived from one of the lesser branches. It is to argue that the whole system of man is derived from one of the lower joints, or that the horse is derived from one of the hind legs.

What reason is there for believing that Peter, James, and John, who John the Baptist informs us held the greater or Melchizedec priesthood came to Joseph and Oliver to confer that priesthood upon them, and did not lay their hands upon them for that purpose? If the priesthood can

be conferred, by simply "commanding" those who do not possess it to ordain themselves, why can't it be so conferred in other, in fact, in *all* other cases? Since the very day of young Joseph's ordination under the hands of those who never possessed that which they claim they put on him have they ever allowed their so-called priesthood to ordain any one "by commandment" alone, or any one to ordain anybody to a priesthood he did not himself hold? Why should there be in the whole history of ordination since the world began, this *one solitary exception*?

But right here some one may start up with the question;—"arn't you a little too fast? Have you never learned that young Joseph was anointed and ordained a prophet, seer and revelator under the hands of Joseph, and Hyrum, and Bishop Newel K. Whitney, in 1844? O yes we have seen that stated in various places since it came out in Saints Herald of June 27, 1885, page 413. You will also find it in Tract 17, called "The Successor," page 9. One James Whitehead of Alton, Ill., we are told, states that he saw Newel K. Whitney, Hyrum Smith, and Joseph Smith thus anoint and ordain young Joseph a prophet, seer, and revelator in 1844, in a room over Joseph's store in Nauvoo. But this story like everything else, gotten up in support of young Joseph's being appointed to succeed his father, carries a lie upon its very face. What business would Hyrum Smith for instance, to say nothing of Bishop Whitney, have to lay on hands to anoint and ordain

to an office which neither of them ever held? And another thing, while there is a rich abundance of evidence to show that God would by revelation appoint a successor through Joseph there is none that shows that Joseph would ordain his successor; *not a line*. Lie No. 7. We will now introduce young Joseph himself as a witness and see what he says about being ordained under the hands of his father. Joseph says of his father, "he *could not ordain* and induct a successor *while himself lived*." (See young Joseph's letter to J. B. Price, in The Saints Advocate of Sept., 1883, vol. 6.) This saying of Joseph's hits Whitehead's testimony so squarely and forcibly upon the head that it does not leave even a kick in it and makes lie No. 8, and so this drives us back again to the Amboy, Ill., conference of April 6th, 1860, for any ordination to the prophetic office he ever had; and as said while speaking of that before; he is just such a prophet seer, revelator, and translator, and prophet like unto Moses as "William Marks, Zenos H. Gurly and the others" who then and there ordained him, can make. In young Joseph's letter to the above J. B. Price he says that his father *blessed* him twice—once in Liberty jail in Missouri, and once in Nauvoo. But it is very plain that he did not regard that *blessing* either an appointment or ordination to the office of his father; if he did why should he say of his father: "he could not ordain and induct a successor, while himself lived." And if he regarded either of these blessings an appointment, or a designation to the

prophetic office, how was it that for so many years preceding his ordination he was at such a loss and had so hard mental work to come to a conclusion that he was called to take any part in Mormonism, and what that part should be? Any one who knowing young Joseph's history, and who knows anything of the history of God's prophets, and would call him a prophet of God must be an exceedingly rare specimen of mankind in his general make up, some how or other. The thing is utterly beyond comprehension to me. Briggs' revelations makes him the "one mighty and strong." Great heavens! mighty and strong in what? As a prophet? As a *seer*? As a revelator? As a revealer and translator of the *sealed oracles and mysteries*? We may well ask here as we have often asked before without getting an answer, if he is a prophet what has he prophesied? As a seer, with the Urum and Thummim in hand,—for this instrument we are informed by Joseph Smith and the Book of Mormon constitutes a seer,—what has he seen thereby either afar off or nigh at hand? As a revelator, what has he brought to light? And as a translator what has he translated or brought to light of the lost treasurers of the past? What has he done in any one of these capacities or directions any more than Brigham Young, or Taylor, or Woodruff or any other upstart? The answer comes as in a voice of thunder, NOTHING, NOTHING! It will soon be fifty years now since the death of the prophet Jo-

seph, who though he lost his gift or retained it, was to appoint one to enter upon the work of bringing to light the dispensations of the past, and if there is any direction in which young Joseph has proved himself "mighty and strong," it is in that he has furnished us with a *mighty* and *strong argument*, that he never was appointed or ordained to the prophetic office! The simple fact that he went to the Gurleyite and Briggsite conference, at Amboy, Ill., and there accepted the ordination of such a set of men as there undertook to ordain him to the prophetic office, is in and of itself a "mighty and strong" argument that he as well as they for some very good reason has been given over to a "mighty and strong" delusion. There is but one reasonable way in which to account for such delusion, and that is simply this: that as James J. Strang has put his claims beyond a *reasonable* doubt, and they all have coolly and without a solitary sound reason rejected them, they have therefore been given over to strong delusion; and so "with good words and fair speeches" on the surface, which they have learned from the works of Joseph and James, they go on deceiving the hearts of the uninformed. (Rom. 16: 17, 18).

These men have said a vast amount about "lineal priesthood," "lineal blessings," and "lineal heirs," etc.; but it is a vain thing for men to talk about possessing these blessings until they are bestowed upon them in a lawful manner; in other words till they are lawfully called and or-



dained to them and receive them under the hands of those who are authorized to bestow them.

Abraham received the promise that in him and in his seed should *all* the nations of the earth be blessed,—a much greater promise than that made to Joseph Smith, yet two thousand years or thereabouts elapse before the person was born who was chosen to accomplish this great work, and nearly two thousand more elapse before that event is accomplished. Says Nephi: "And I would my brethren that ye should know that all the kindreds of the earth cannot be blessed unless he shall make bare his arm in the eyes of the nations. Wherefore he shall proceed (in the Latter Days) to make bare his arm in the eyes of all the nations, in bringing about his covenants and his gospel unto those who are of the house of Israel." (1st Book of Nephi, chapter 7.)

Now a promise something like the one above made to Abraham, is made to Joseph Smith in these days. "In thee and in thy seed shall the *kindred* of the earth be blessed." "The kindred of the earth," cannot mean "*all* the kindreds of the earth," for the very good reason that that very important work belongs to the Messiah who is of the tribe of Judah; and to say that the promise made to Joseph is the same as that made to Abraham is to confound Joseph and Judah together. And as the promise to Abraham mentions neither person, time, nor place, so the promise made to Joseph points out neither person, time, or place in Joseph's lineage,

either; and at best can only refer to some one in Joseph's lineage, at some future day to be called, anointed and ordained to be a blessing to some *one* of the kindreds of the earth.

The vast period that transpired before the Messiah came, in whom was centered the blessing of all the kindreds of earth, ought to admonish all that God in his own way and in his own good time will fulfill the promise made to Joseph as he fulfilled it to Abraham; and that great things are, or may be promised to other men, as well as to Joseph, which must be fulfilled before this promise to Joseph can be.

Another blessing sealed upon Joseph Smith was, that "*his blessing* shall be put upon the *head* of his posterity." The Reorganized leaders have in a very plausible way tried to make it appear that "*his blessing*," Joseph's blessing, was Joseph's Priesthood; and the *head* of Joseph's posterity was young Joseph's head. But it is apparent that blessing may be conferred in many thousands of instances without once conferring priesthood, and that the blessing of a prophet of God and his Priesthood are two very different things. We have a very good example of a prophet of God conferring or putting his blessing upon the head of his posterity in Jacob blessing his twelve sons, beginning by putting his hands upon the head of Reuben and going down to the last born; but we are not assured that he conferred any priesthood upon any one

of them on this occasion. So also in Isaac blessing Jacob and Esau, and Lehi blessing his sons.

A man's posterity is evidently his children or descendants; and the *head* of a man's posterity is evidently the head of every son and daughter in that posterity. To suppose that the first born alone is the head of a man's posterity, and especially in such cases as Joseph Smith's or any other man empowered to confer blessings upon his family and descendants, does gross injustice to all the rest of the family. Why should the first born have all the blessing and all the rest of the children none? What was there especially in the character of young Joseph that entitled him to all the blessing and shut all the others out of any? For in making him alone the head of his father's posterity the blessing of course goes all upon him? Lie No. 9. I have no doubt that Joseph and Hyrum and Whitney did lay on hands upon young Joseph and that Joseph did bless him. And I am as well satisfied that he blessed others in his family and kindred as well as him; but I am very far from believing that he conferred his prophetic office upon them all, or upon any one of them; for that is very clearly a gift that was not in his own individual power to confer upon any one. That is most emphatically a work that belongs to God only, and comes by *direct revelation* from him, to the proper person who only is authorized to appoint.

We have thus by the word of God fully and justly tested the Reorgani-

zation, and found it based upon a mass of lies and most gross perversions of the word of God. Grosser and more wicked than even Brighamism; and feel that no man can carefully read and examine these things in the light of reason and the law and the testimony of God without having his faith shaken in the whole claims and basis of that structure. And as the works and ministry of James J. Strang was only a faithful carrying on and out, of the work of Joseph, he must either adopt the works of Mr. Strang or go on to hopeless delusion and infidelity. We have not resorted either to slander or defamation of moral character in order either to establish or defend Mr. Strang's claims, or to destroy faith in the Reorganization. We have simply taken their own history, their own statements, their own revelations and testimonies and in the light of God's truth fully demonstrated them all to be false; and that their authors have also "given themselves to lies, and their hearts to wickedness."

Many among the leaders, and led of the Reorganization may not realize the wrong and outrage there is in the formation of that church. But the awful denunciations of God's judgment against all who pervert and handle the word of God deceitfully, ought to awaken them to a sense of their awful situation.

"O the wise, the learned, and the rich, that are puffed up in the pride of their hearts, and *and all those who teach false doctrine* and all who commit whoredoms, and *all those who per-*

vert the right way of the Lord: Woe, woe, woe, be unto them, saith the Lord God Almighty, for they shall be cast down to hell." (12th chapter, 2d Book of Nephi, page 2.) No one knowing the diabolical lies and perversions of the word of God upon which the Reorganization is based, but must regard that structure only as "a bowing wall, and a tottering fence, whose breaking cometh at an instant, suddenly." It must fall. It cannot stand long upon such a basis of lies and perversions of the word of God.

## CHAPTER II.

JAMES J. STRANG AS A KING.

What a hue and cry the Reorganized leaders have raised at the idea of James exercising in some limited degree the kingly office! They seem to be too ignorant of the order of the Melchizedec Priesthood to recognize the fact that the kingly office belongs as much to that Priesthood as the office of Elder or High Priest belong to it. There never was a prophet of God, like unto Moses, since the world began, but was in virtue of the priesthood he held, a king. They are often called also High Priests, Elders, Teachers, Priests, and may properly be called by anyone of these names, simply because that all the offices in the whole priesthood is contained and carried within the prophetic office. They can ordain to and officiate in all these offices, and it is from that Priesthood that all other priesthoods is derived.

In the United States the people have a very strong prejudice against

the word King; and the Reorganized leaders always take the advantage of that prejudice when setting forth their views of Mr. Strang's ministry. But in fact the word Priest, and High Priest, and Priesthood, are also so very objectionable in many places that one has almost to beg pardon for mentioning these terms in setting forth the claims of the church in these days. The very best men that ever lived were kings. Jesus was a king. Moses was a king. (Deut. 33:5. Num. 23:21) Melchizedec was a king. Nephi was a king. Mosiah was a king. Benjamin also, and from the time of Nephi down to the time of the II Mosiah there was a line of kings extending over a period of some five hundred years. And my opinion is that this five hundred years rule will compare very well with a like period at any other time, for general justice, equity, and the peace of mankind. Take the two Mosias and Benjamin, and Nephi especially, and better and more upright men never reigned or ruled over any people.

"If ye could have men for your kings, who would do even as my father Benjamin did for his people, I say unto you, if this could always be the case, then it would be expedient that ye should always have kings to rule over you. \* \* \* And now I say unto you that *because all men are not just*, it is not expedient that ye should have a king or kings to rule over you." (Book of Mosiah, chap 13.) Here is a plain statement by one of the best of men that the kingly government, if



the kings are just, is the best government for man. James J. Strang was a very bad man in the eyes of his enemies of course, but in the light of God's eternal truth and justice, no king that ever wore a crown was ever more worthy of one than he. The great King of kings is of course the one and the great exception always; but with this one a more just man, a meeker man, a more patient man, a more temperate man, a man of more soundness and sagacity in judgment, and quicker and readier to discern the right in deeply complicated matters and questions, never wore a crown anywhere. And whenever and wherever accomplished scoundrelism and educated and refined knavery took a stand, or arrayed themselves either against him or the righteous cause he had espoused, his ready wit and piercing rebuke was simply terrible. These could not endure in his presence, and they fled like wolves howling against him. His talents and his attainments in varied learning and science were of a very high order. In all his public controversies he was just, generous, candid and honorable with his opponents, and his arguments are models of excellence, logical and convincing to the honest seeker after truth. The honest poor man, the laboring man, and the downtrodden, no matter whether their oppressors were great or small, rich or poor, had always a most faithful friend and father in him. No man without these qualities and attainments can ever be a faithful and just ruler of his fellow men, and all these he possessed in an

eminent and high degree. "He that rules over men must be just, ruling in the fear of the Lord." And if James J. Strang was not a just man in the full sense of that word, without respect of persons, neither fearing the rich nor despising the poor, where in the history of the past or the present will a just man be found? Despise Mr. Strang's ministry if you will, but remember that God has made him "a stumbling block and a rock of offense" to all those who reject either his words that God gave him, or himself as a prophet of God. Though it be even the sons of the prophet Joseph himself, God has sworn that they will be all rejected at the time of his coming. Be ye warned therefore in time, ye despisers and defamers.

It is a vain thing for you to cry out "he took several wives and that is enough for me." If this is enough to justify you in rejecting him, then to be consistent with yourselves it is enough to justify you in rejecting the whole Bible from Genesis to Revelations. Above all things when you feel actuated to get up before a public audience to prove that the aborigines of this continent are descendants of the Patriarch Joseph, try and get at that matter without using old Jacob's blessing upon the head of his son Joseph. Avoid also using the Psalms of David for that purpose for these two men according to *your* arguments were only whoremasters and denied the faith and had not the spirit to prophesy or to do anything else in righteousness. When you feel disposed to preach from the text "Many shall come from the east and

the west and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," etc., a little reflection will tell you that this text is a lie, for Jacob and Abraham were whoremasters; at least Jacob was one all his married life. Again when you preach on the necessity of a living faith, and feel disposed to quote the 11th chapter of Paul to the Hebrews, you cannot think otherwise than that Paul was in a very gross error when he gave us David and Gideon and Jacob and others as examples in goodness and virtue, when you know very well they must have denied the faith, and are all cast down to hell. So also when you run across the words of Peter where he makes David as a prophet prophesy of Christ that he must have been greatly mistaken, also as no one with any more wives than one could have the spirit of prophecy. Then again you must know that even Jesus himself must have been greatly in the dark when he said: "If they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither would they believe if one rose from the dead." For Moses we know very well instituted a law that quite as much justified a plurality of wives as single marriages. And therefore he could not have the spirit of God and is gone down to hell with the balance as the worst of all. So there are full fifty other things that might be pointed out that will or ought to impell you to reject all the prophets since the world began, for the very same reason that you rejected James. James never violated the law that forbids the taking of many wives, neither did Jacob;

neither did Moses; neither did Samuel's father; neither did many other very good men in Israel who took a small number of wives. David and Solomon "took many wives" and concubines or servant wives, which thing was abominable in the sight of God,—always was and always will be. They simply multiplied wives; that is they multiplied the plural and thus increased them into a multitude. The Reorganized logician very glibly says, "twice one make two, that is multiplying," but we answer that that would be multiplying only the singular, and not the plural which is the thing forbidden. When one multiplies words he multiplies the plural. When he multiplies facts he multiplies the plural. When he multiplies arguments he multiplies the plural. So when we read "When men began to multiply," we understand that the men, the plural of man were there to begin with.

In pleading at the bar, having brought forth a sufficient number of facts to establish either the truth or the falsity of any position or case, men frequently make use of the expression, Why multiply facts? Why multiply instances? Why multiply examples? Thousands of instances might be furnished of this kind, and all understand what it means. The following are additional examples: "That your days may be multiplied." (Deut. 11:21.) "But Ammon multiplied his trespasses." (2d Chron. 33:23.) "Their sorrows shall be multiplied that hasten after another God." (Ps. 16:4.) "For our transgressions are multiplied before thee."



(Is. 59:12). "And Judah hath multiplied *fenced cities*." (Hos. 8:14.) "Thou has multiplied thy *merchants* above the stars." (Nah. 3:16) "The *people* grew and multiplied in Egypt." (Acts 7:17.) "And when the number of the *disciples* was multiplied." (Acts 6:1) Then the *churches*, "walking in the fear of the Lord, and the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied." (Acts 9:31.)

It is in very good keeping with the lying foundation upon which the Reorganization is founded, to tell us that few means many, and that there is do difference between multiplying the singular and the plural; thus requiring men in their sober senses to believe that God limits men and even kings to one horse as well as one wife. For the command to the kings of Israel forbade them to multiply horses as well as wives. (See Deut. 17:16,17.)

The best authorities upon the English tell us that the word *many*, especially in its more ancient signification, means a great number, a multitude.

But the above is by no means the end of the Reorganized blunders, by a very great deal. In order to make a full sweep of every thing that would justify an honorable and just man in the taking of several wives, they proclaim that Jesus fulfilled and abolished the whole law of God given in the days of Moses; and in fact that there is nothing of the Mosaic code now binding or of any authority or force in the church of God except such parts as are named in the Doctrine and Covenants. The character

of this blunder is so sweeping and wholesale in itself, that a thinking man can only stand aghast at its magnitude. What is called the Law of the Lord, the moral law, etc., is so self-evidently a law of necessity, or a law absolutely necessary to the life, and peace and eternal welfare of man, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that he who would deny its necessity today, and in all the ages of man is either so blind that he does not see his own blindness, or else that he is wilfully corrupt. If it be true that "where there is no law there is no transgression," then in case that law is abolished, you may commit any kind, or any amount of crime and you can do no wrong. You can join in with mobs, murderers, adulterers, liars, thieves, sabbath breakers, slanderers, sodomites, idolators, men-stealers, perjurers, traitors, back-biters, haters of God, blasphemers, the unthankful, unholy, murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, and in fact you may violate everything "that is contrary to sound doctrine," and you commit no crime; for there being no law against any of these things, there can be no transgression, no crime, no sin in any of them. The Law of God given to Moses and the prophets before and after him, most solemnly forbids all these things, and commands their opposite in all points. And there is no species of wrong but what these commandments forbid, and there is no principle of right but what they teach and command. To say that Jesus Christ did these things all away, is to say that the whole gospel



which he taught is simply a gospel of anarchy. double refined, without a single redeeming principle of life in it. Could Jesus for instance do away with the law "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and still require that duty of us? And if he requires it of us, how is it done away? (See Lev. 19: 18, 34.)

If Jesus has done away the Law "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul," etc., why does he require it in the New Testament? And if he requires it, How is it done away? (Deut. 6:5; 10:12; 11:1.)

If Jesus has done away the Law, "Thou shalt judge thy neighbor in righteousness," how could he say to his people, "Judge not unrighteously that ye be not judged?" If it is done away, why should it be in the Inspired New Testament, the Book of Mormon, and the Doctrine and Covenants? (Deut. 1: 16, 17; Math. 7: 2, 3.)

The Law of the Lord requires that as often as a man finds any lost thing belonging to his neighbor, whether it be ox, or ass, or sheep, or garment, or whatever thing it may be, he must return it to his neighbor. Is the gospel so refined, so pure, and holy that it does not include this most excellent and necessary obligation? Just try it, my Reorganized friend, once and see how well your neighbor will be pleased with you, more especially when you tell him that "this old law was done away in Christ and no longer needed." (Deut. 22: 1-4; Math. 7:12.) It is said by one of the prophets in reference to him that is

mighty to save and to deliver, that he shall "*Magnify* the law, and make it honorable." (Is. 42:22, Inspired.) Does magnifying it and making it *honorable* do it away? To magnify anything is evidently to enlarge it and make it so plain in itself as we have never been able to see it before. By expounding it in its more obscure parts enlightens and enlarges our views of it, and thus we feel to honor and respect it rather a great deal than to do it away.

God through the prophet Malachi addresses himself thus to the people who in the last days are to be looking for his sons second coming, as follows:

"Behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud and all that do wickedly shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. But unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth and grow up as calves of the stall. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I do this saith the Lord of hosts. Remember *ye* (who are thus looking for my coming.) the Law of Moses my servant *which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel with the statutes and the judgments.* Behold I will send *you* Elijah the prophet *before the coming of the great and dreadful day* of the Lord," etc. (Mal. chap 4.)

This language is most unmistakable and wholly and clearly refers to the

Latter Day Saints in these days. How a commandment to *remember* this law with its statutes and judgments can be harmonized with the idea of its being abolished and done away, is a great deal more than I can tell.

Now that Jesus did *fulfill* and make an end of *some* law, called the Law of Moses, we must all freely admit; but what that law was, or is, is the great question, and one which I confess has in no small degree puzzled me, and no doubt has and does others. I have read many authors, and enquired here and there, but all seemed dark and perplexing. One said it was the whole law given on Sinai and everywhere else in Moses' ministry; another that it was all except the Ten Commandments. Another that it was the "ceremonial law," and still another that it was the whole of the Old Testament. This latter I found to be the most confounding, perplexing, and bewildering of all the rest, and yet I find some very prominent men in the Reorganization advocating it. After wading through vast piles of sectarian and priestly rubbish in the fruitless search for a solution to this most important question, I have found that the much despised Book of Mormon has a very grand key to it; and John Wesley in his 25th sermon comes the next nearest to it of any I have read. Let us go back to the time of Abinidi, (Book of Mosiah, chap. 8: par. 1.)

"And now I say unto you that it was expedient that there should be a law given to the children of Israel, yea even a very strict law; for they

were a *stiff necked* people; quick to do iniquity and slow to *remember the Lord their God*; therefore there was a law given, yea a law of performances and ordinances, a law which they were to observe strictly from day to day, to *keep them in remembrance of God* and their duty toward *him*."

The above will be better and more clearly understood by quoting from Ezekiel 20: 24, 25: "Because they had not executed (put in force) my *judgments*, but had despised my *statutes*, and had polluted my *sabbaths*, and their eyes were after their fathers' idols. Wherefore (or for this reason) I gave them *also* statutes, that were *not good*, and judgments whereby they should not live," etc. It is plain from these two passages that there was a pre-existing code of laws, *statutes*, *judgments* and *sabbaths*, enjoined upon Israel, to which they were slow to render obedience. They were stiff necked and regardless of these duties though the Almighty repeatedly says that they were a law of life and peace and security and prosperity in all things to them; and so because of their stiff neckedness, their slowness to hearken to these most precious things God "gave them also statutes that were *not good*, and judgments whereby they should not live;" a very strict law to constantly remind them of this law of life which they had been so slow to observe. This is the law that Peter says "neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." (Acts 15:10.) This is the law that was "added *because of transgression* till the seed



should come to whom the promise was made in the Law of Moses." (Gal. 3:19.)

This is the law which Paul tells us "was not made for a righteous man, (that is, one who keeps the commandments, the laws, and Sabbaths, and counsels of God) but was made *'for the lawless,'* and *disobedient,* for the *ungodly* and *for sinners,*" for whoremongers, for menstealers, for perjured men, and in short for whatsoever was contrary to "sound doctrine" as it was committed to Paul and others to preach in all the world. (1st Tim. 1: 8-11.) For how can a man be a *righteous* man, unless he is governed in all his actions by a righteous law? And how can a man transgress law where there is no law to transgress? "For where there is no law there is no transgression." This is the law that "made nothing perfect." (Heb. 7:19.) This added law was our schoolmaster to bring men to the observance of those other laws which lead to repentance and unto Christ, but which when faith in Christ came, men were no longer under. This is the law which Abinidi says "the time shall come when it shall no more be expedient to keep it." (Book of Mosiah, chap. 8:1.)

We now come to enquire more particularly what that added law was, which was enjoined upon Israel so strictly, to keep them in the remembrance of the pre-existing laws, statutes, Sabbaths and commandments of God. The prophet Alma says:

"Therefore there can be nothing which is short of an infinite atonement, which will suffice for the sins

of the world; therefore it is expedient that there should be a great and last sacrifice; and then shall there be or it is expedient there should be, a stop to the shedding of blood; then shall the law of Moses be fulfilled, yea, it shall all be fulfilled; every jot and tittle, and *none shall have passed away.* And behold, *this is the whole meaning of the law;* every whit pointing to that *great and last sacrifice.* and that great and last sacrifice will be the Son of God."

And thus mercy can satisfy the demands of justice, and encircles them in the arms of safety, while he that exercises no faith unto repentance is exposed to the whole law of the demands of justice; therefore *only unto him that has faith unto repentance* is brought about the great and eternal plan of redemption." (Book of Alma, chap. 16.)

Here then, the nature of this monitor, this schoolmaster, this reminder of duty, this added law, is made plain and shown to be the shedding of blood (of beasts) for the remission of sins, and the laws and ceremonies in relation to these offerings. But what is the most remarkable about it is that though it has an end in Christ, yet it is only to those who believe in Christ, and who exercise faith unto *repentance*, who are freed from this law; and though these are freed from this law, this law itself neither passes away from the code, nor is it in any one jot or tittle abolished. All these laws will remain on the statute books of God for countless generations to show men the righteousness of God, and to enable



all the rising generations to understand that none of his laws can be disregarded without just punishment following. There will be no transgression of God's law during the Millenium; so we are assured by many prophecies; but the law of God, the statutes of God, the judgments of God, the counsels of God, the precepts of God, and the penalties attached to the violation of all these things will be there all the same. According to this then the law of sacrifice, or the shedding of the blood of beasts for the remission of sins is just as much in force upon the unbelieving Jews as it ever was, and must needs be so until faith in Christ comes, and their lives are made by repentance to conform to the Law of life given to their fathers.

Jesus calling out of the heavens to the people on this land who were spared from the great destructions following his crucifixion, says: "Behold by me redemption cometh; and in me is the law of Moses fulfilled. I am the light and the life of the world. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. And ye shall offer up unto me no more the shedding of blood, for I will accept none of your sacrifices and your burnt offerings and ye shall offer a sacrifice unto me of a broken heart and a contrite spirit." (Book of Nephi, chap. 4.)

Having as I trust made it pretty plain that the law, commandments, judgments, and Sabbaths given on Sinai, are not abolished nor done away in a single jot or tittle, and cannot be without being followed

by great injury to man, it will not appear to right minded men at any rate that Mr. Strang was *such a dreadful* criminal after all; but one who in a very eminent degree followed the law and the statutes and counsels of God.

What is true of the Book of Mormon, is also true of the Book of the Law. The less a man knows about either, the more he is inclined to doubt and disregard them. The more he searches and tests them, the better he is satisfied that the God of life and inspiration has revealed them both. The opposite is true of the creeds and claims of both the sectarians and the Reorganization. The less one knows about them the more regard and reverence he has for them. The more he knows about them and tests them by the Word of God, the less he cares for them.

When the Almighty brings his people under the bond of the Covenant in these latter days and writes his laws on their minds and hearts, what laws will they be? Something different to those revealed to Abraham and all his forefathers from Adam, and given anew on Sinai? Ask Malachi, chap. 4: 4. Ask Math. 5: 17, 18, 19. Ask Mal. 3: 7-10. Zech. 14: 16, 17. Ask the last 8 chapters of the Book of Ezekiel. Doc. & Cov., sec. 42: 7th and 16th pp. 2d Book of Nephi, chap. 12. This latter says: "Wherefore murmur ye because that ye shall receive more of my word? \* \* \* Wherefore I speak the same words unto one nation like unto another. And when the two nations run together, the testimony of the

two nations run together also. And this I do that I may prove unto many, that I am the same yesterday, today and forever."

If he is the same yesterday, today and forever, he will give us the same laws, the same priesthood, the same order, the same kind of officers, the same gifts and blessings; the same privileges to just men to increase and to multiply. And as he has made great promises to the house of David in the last days, to make them kings over Israel and leaders and deliverers, we may rest fully assured that he will accomplish all his promises to a certainty. I am quite willing, if God has so designed it, that the prophetic office is always and forevermore to run in Joseph Smith's family. But as it has heretofore run in all the families of Israel; first in one and then in another, what evidence is there that it will now run exclusively in Joseph Smith's family? None at all; as instance the following: "Behold the days come saith the Lord that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the land. *In his days shall Judah be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely*, and this is the name whereby he shall be called: THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." (Jer. 23: 5, 6; 33: 15-17.) It is very natural to apply the above prophecies to Jesus Christ, and his day. But a very little reflection will convince any one that "*in his days*" Judah was neither saved nor did Israel dwell safely; any thing but that. Moreover the above language is in its

connections pointing wholly to the latter days, and will refer to no other time. "For thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel. Neither shall the Priests, the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings," etc. (Jer. 33: 17, 18.)

"The throne of the house of Israel" is evidently the throne of David, of whom God says, "I will build up thy throne to *all generations*."

No one need doubt that the 11th chapter of Isaiah wholly refers to our day; for the angel who visited Joseph Smith in an early day in this generation said to him after quoting this chapter, that "*it was ABOUT TO BE fulfilled*." Well what do we find in this chapter? The following: First, that a "branch" is to grow out of the roots, or the covered, hidden, or lost stock of the family of Jesse, the father of David, of the tribe of Judah. This "Branch" can be no other than the one spoken of by Jeremiah in the two chapters above quoted. Secondly, the gathering of the whole house of Israel from all lands where they have been scattered and cast out, is evidently to be accomplished by and under this prophet and kingly "Branch" of the house of David; for he is to be set up as an "ensign to the nations and assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four quarters of the earth. This cannot refer to either Joseph Smith or Jesus Christ in the ministry of either; for neither gathered Israel after this pattern; neither will this language refer to Jesus Christ after his second



coming; because all Israel is to be gathered before he comes, so as to be prepared to meet him at his coming. The gathering of Israel is clearly to take place before the nations of the Gentiles are cut off; and we read also that it is the Gentiles who are to be instrumental by their boats and ships and roads, who are to carry Israel to their own lands. Their "*flying* upon the shoulders of the Philistines toward the west," (verse 14) can mean nothing less than being carried swiftly by steam, both by land and by water by the Gentiles. Moreover, many of the Gentiles also are to seek to this "standard" of the house of David, and his "rest shall be glorious" to them. It seems also that it is through the ministry of this great heir of the throne of David, that the enmity of the wild and tame beasts is to come to an end, and the knowledge of the Lord is to cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. As the angel who visited Joseph Smith quoted this 11th chapter of Isaiah and told him that it was "*about to be fulfilled*," there should be no misunderstanding or doubt about its being fulfilled in this dispensation. (Times & Seasons, vol. iii, page 753.) The Book of Mormon also tells us that not only shall one of the loins of Joseph write, but that one of the loins of Judah shall write also; and that the things written by both shall grow together to the confounding of false doctrines, and the laying down of contentions and the establishing of peace among the fruit of the loins of Joseph.

Now the Book of Mormon is evi-

dently the writing of Joseph, or the work spoken of to be written by a prophet of the loins of Joseph in the latter days; but in connection with this we are told that the fruit of the loins of Judah also shall write, and that the writings of both shall *grow together*, etc. Now as the fruit of the loins of Joseph evidently means Jos Smith, the fruit of the *loins* of Judah also must mean a prophet of the tribe of Judah. The Bible can not be the writing of the *fruit of the loins of Judah* meant in the prophecy; for the simple reason that the Bible is the work of many prophets of various lineages. Moses wrote a very considerable part of the Bible and he was of the tribe of Levi. (Exod. 2: 1-10.) Joshua was of the tribe of Ephraim. (Num. 13: 8, 16.) Jeremiah was of the tribe of Benjamin. (Jer. 1:1.) Samson was of the tribe of Dan. (Jud. 23: 2-24.) Elijah was of Manassah. (1st Kings 17:1.) Ezekiel was of the tribe of Levi. (Ezek. I: 3.) And so on with all the rest. To suppose that the Bible was a work of the fruit of the *loins* of Judah is nonsense. Moreover this writing of the fruit of the loins of Judah must immediately succeed the writings of the fruit of the loins of Joseph; because they both are to work together to put down false doctrine, and contentions, and the establishing of peace, etc., all of which relates to time; for there will be no contentions and false doctrines to put down in the Millennium. These things also show the lying character of the Reorganization, namely that the prophetic office runs wholly in



the lineage of Joseph. There is not one word of truth in this doctrine. From the days of Adam to the present time the prophetic office has never run steadily in one family or tribe, but has passed from one tribe and family to another, and all the tribes have had the prophetic office in them at one time or another just as God saw proper and fit to call men out of them into it. (Mr. Strang claimed to be a prophet of the tribe of Judah in the lineage of David.)

As a good deal has been said about "violating the laws of the land, on Beaver Island," a word or two on that head. Mr. Strang never violated nor encouraged others to violate the laws of the land. His claim and office as a king was exercised in a church or ecclesiastical capacity, and not in opposition to the laws of the land. We had the law of God among us, by which we learned that there were many things in the laws of the state contrary to God's law; but the laws of God in such cases were never enforced contrary to those laws. There were a few cases on the Islands where men according to God's law, deserved death; but that law was not enforced up on them, because it was opposed by state law. But both the law of God, and the laws of the land justify men in protecting their lives, and the lives of their families and property, and the Mormons took such measures, and resorted to just such means as to them were best calculated to accomplish that work. Who says that man has no right to defend himself against his enemy? We do not believe in either provok-

ing an enemy, or courting death; but we are informed in the Book of Mormon that in "as much as we are not guilty of the first and second offense, we shall not suffer ourselves to be slain." And this was the command of God, both to the Nephites, and to their fathers. (Book of Alma, chap. 20.)

Alma has given us also the history in brief of a man named Moroni; a most excellent man, firm in the faith of Christ, who "had *sworn* with an oath, to defend his people, his rights, and his country, and his religion, even to the loss of his blood. Now the Nephites were taught to defend themselves against their enemies, even to the shedding of blood, if it were necessary, yea, and they were also taught never to give an offense; and never to raise the sword except it were against an enemy to preserve their lives." And again we read: "They were sorry to be the means of sending so many of their brethren out of the world, into an eternal world unprepared to meet their God; nevertheless they could not suffer to lay down their lives that their wives and children should be massacred, by the barbarous cruelty of those who were once their brethren, and had left them and had gone to destroy them by joining the Lamanites."

Moroni not only entered into an oath and covenant to defend his country and people but he demanded that all who wished to maintain their freedom, rights, and religion should also enter into that oath and covenant. And those who would not do it were put to death. (Chap. 21.) I

have no doubt that to the Gurleyite leaders of Moroni and Alma's day, these things looked quite as bad as they look to those of today. But they are on record for our learning, nevertheless.

"And whosoever of the Amalikites that would not enter into a covenant to support the cause of freedom, that they might maintain a free government, he (Moroni) caused to be put to death." Supposing that some Strangite Mormon had done with some of the enemies of the Mormons on Beaver Island, as the young man Ammon did with those who came and tried to stampede the sheep that he was herding,—cut off some of their arms, and killed others—what an eternal howling the Gurleyite leaders would have kept up about it!

During the whole residence of the Mormons on Beaver Island there never was a man killed there but one, and he was shot after shooting at the constable and his posse, who were sent by the mandate of the prosecuting attorney of the county of Mackinaw to arrest criminals. There were some seventy desperate and lawless men banded together to resist all law, determined that none of them should be arrested for any crime. Some of these being charged with assault and battery (a very mild term; for they had broken a man's arm, and fractured his skull by bludgeons, crying, "Kill him, G—d d—n him, kill him.") An arrest was ordered; they fired on the constable, who fell wounded; the posse fired in return and one Thomas Bennett fell dead. This killing, un-

till Mr. Strang himself was assassinated in cold blood, was all the killing that ever took place during the nine years' residence of the Mormons there, and yet the howling about piracy, vessel scuttling, treason, felony, and various other crimes "by order of King Strang," has been so constantly kept up by their enemies, one would almost imagine that there was scarcely an acre of Lake Michigan for fifty miles around that does not contain at least one man assassinated by Mormon hands. Those Chauncey Loomises and others who are or have been so awfully struck at Mr. Strang appearing in the kingly regalia, as an heir of David, may well ask themselves what they are going to do when the heir of David before referred to comes up in fulfillment of the prophecy of Moses, by whom all who will not hear his voice shall be destroyed from *among* the the people? For remember that the angels who have revealed the Book of Mormon have told us that this also is about to be fulfilled. (Times & Seasons, vol. 3, page 753.) It must refer to time; it cannot refer to the millennium, for there will be no killing there, as all will be peace.

"In time ye shall have *no king* nor *RULER*; for I (God) will be your king and watch over you," is a saying often quoted against the idea of there being any king over the latter day saints. Taken in the beautiful view of the leading Gurleyites in opposing Mr. Strang it would imply that we are to have a state of anarchy double refined; for all experience shows that where there is no king nor ruler there

anarchy reigns complete. The idea of God or any one else being a king over any people, where he had no ruler and no one claiming or endowed with authority from him to rule in his name is amusing and novel indeed. The saying taken in connection with many other prophetic sayings in relation to these days simply implies that so far as Gentile power is concerned, the saints "*in time*" will have neither king nor ruler of that kind, and will only have the laws of God, and rulers wholly of his appointment and authority over them. Any one who will take pains to read the words of the Saviour to the Nephites (see last two paragraphs of chap. 9; 3d Book of Nephi, and Micah 5: 8 to 15.) must see that this nation's rule and power cannot exist over the Saints any longer than when the gospel goes to the house of Israel. God has sworn to break this nation in pieces because of the innocent blood shed in this land, and for the oppressions, robberies, outrages, adulteries, and corruptions existing among them, of all kinds. It is God, remember, who has said these things and not us, and he will accomplish all his decrees. And when this nation falls and is overwhelmed by the judgments of God, it is then that he will reign "whose right it is, and will subdue all enemies under his feet." There are many things in holy writ pointing to this very thing in these last days. How! if you will, about entering upon and taking of great covenants to serve the Lord and keep his commandments; but how will you feel when you come up in the great

day of God's righteous judgment when it will be found that all who have received the holy priesthood receive an oath and covenant, that cannot be broken; so important in itself, that it cannot be *altogether* departed from, without forfeiting forgiveness, both "in this life or the life to come?" (Doc. & Cov., sec. 83: 6; sec. 101: 1; sec. 81: 4; sec. 77: 2, 3.)

Now Mr. Isaac Scott parades and flaunts a covenant before the public as the one entered into by the followers of Mr. Strang; but we know no such covenant as he exhibits being among us. We do remember taking a covenant to be faithful to the commandments of God however; not a secret covenant nor anything favoring a "secret combination" but a public covenant, intended for *all the people*, men and women, and we are not conscious of having bound ourselves to do any immoral thing or violate any principal of right, but on the contrary to uphold all that is sacred and and just, especially the law and counsels of God from which all true and upright principles are derived. But by the way, How did Mr. Isaac Scott come in possession of that covenant, which he parades before the Herald readers? Did he take that covenant himself or did he get it from somebody else who did take it? And if either, how did he or that somebody else reveal it among men, without perjuring himself? And if he has perjured himself, must he not have immense cheek to ask thinking men to believe the mere statements of perjured men?



Is not Scott and his testimony in relation to what C. P. Barns, and Ben Perce (both of whom are dead) told *him* in relation to the Voree Records, a pretty specimen of humanity to receive testimony of, and for saints to rest their faith on? Having put himself on record long years ago as a slanderer, forger, and liar, is it a very easy matter for him to have a better opinion of his neighbors than he has of himself?

The witnesses to those plates in Voree tell us that the case containing them was found imbedded in indurated (hardened) clay so closely fitting it, that it broke in taking it out. That is, the case was so imbedded in the hardened earth all around it that the case broke in taking it out of its bed in that clay. The case itself was made of baked clay resembling that from which the white Milwaukee brick is made, and under Scott's *tamping* process must have been pounded all to pieces. A flat stone one foot wide each way, and three inches thick was found over the case containing the record; and we are just a little curious to know how that stone ever got in so far under that tree through a two, or two and a half inch auger hole? Will not Scott inform us? Perhaps he will say that stone was always there. But if so, how did the party manage to divine its existence, so as to get that record right under it? Was not that a very fortunate hit on their part?

The Reorganization being based upon self-evident lies and falsehood, it will no doubt be pleased with Scott's lying testimonies; for that

which is based upon lies, must be constantly supported by lies and falsehood.

Say the witnesses, "We examined as we dug all the way with the utmost care, and we say with the utmost confidence that no part of the earth through which we dug exhibited any sign or indication that it had been moved or disturbed at any time previous."

The following are found in Zion's Reveille, vol. 2, No. 3:—

"ISAAC SCOTT, CAPTAIN BOGART'S PROTEGE.—That the brethren at a distance may know what reliance is to be placed on the statements of this delectable pseudo, who appears in the anti Mormon New Era, as the endorser of William E. McLellan, we will simply say that he was a *protege* of Captain Bogart (a noble band of of Brothers) and that Bogart, McLellan, and Scott were cheek-by-jole associates. Scott told Bishop Fuller that he stood by Bogart while he murdered a man, and still he calls Bogart an excellent foster father. The following certificates will show Scott's and McLellan's co-operation with the mob party for the consummation of their nefarious purposes:

*"Voree, Jan. 25, 1847.*

"To whom it may concern: This is to certify that William E. McLellan commanded an anti-Mormon company, who (with faces blacked) co operated with the other mob troops, to deprive the Mormons of their possessions, and drive them from the state. McLellan said, 'I wish to God that I could see Jo Smith brought into the public square

and BEHEADED, for if the G—d d—n rascal is taken to Liberty he will escape.

"At this time Joseph Smith and Hyrum and Sidney and other prisoners were seated in a wagon, and fourteen guns were presented to their breasts, but the general slaughter was prevented by the interference of John C. Annis. McLellan was decorated with a variety of different colored ribbons upon his hat and shoulders and arms as badges of distinction.

"M. AVERY.

"Voree, Jan. 25, 1844.

"To whom it may concern: This is to certify that Isaac Scott has for many years been regarded as a vile apostate, and that he was in consequence of his apostasy, removed from the office of Chorister of the branch over which Emer Harris presided.

"D. AVERY.

"Voree, Jan. 25, 1847.

"To whom it may concern: "This is to certify that Isaac Scott told us that he was cut off from the church in Missouri, and that he continued out of the church ever after until he came here. He has co-operated with the enemies of the church. In consequence of his treachery he never had the confidence of the faithful and virtuous members.

"U. C. H. NICKERSON.

"JOHN McCONNELL."

From Zion's Reveille, vol. 2, No. 7:

"The honest are beginning to see the knavery and treachery of such vile impostors as William E. McLellan, Collins Pemberton, and Isaac Scott, the inglorious trio of nefarious pseudoes. They should

be scorned like other scorpion pseudoes by all respectable men, for their pens are like asps, their tongues like adders, and their breath like a breeze from the Buhon Upas; they have charmed like sirens, but like Lucifer they have been cast out by the fiat of the Almighty to receive the perdition of ungodly men."

A few years before Joseph and Hyrum Smith were killed, John C. Bennett wrote his "Expose" of Mormonism and Joseph Smith in particular, and this "Expose" had no very little to do with the martyrdom of both Joseph and Hyrum Smith. After Joseph's death, Bennett seemed to be horror stricken at what he had done, and came to Voree, and in the deepest humility and tears confessed his wrongs and asked forgiveness. To be brief, he was received and remained in the church at Voree for a short period; but at length he is again overtaken in crime and is again cast out. But notwithstanding his confession and tears of penitence for what he had written, Isaac Scott and his associates used to quote from and bear witness of the truth of Bennett's work. And now he thinks Bennett a very bad man; accusing him, in connection with James, of imposing upon innocent men and women with "phosphorus and oil," for an endowment of gifts and blessings. Mr. Isaac Scott claims to have a number of sworn statements of different men who used to be leading men under James, testifying to his wicked teachings, From what I see in Scott's history and the history of his cronies, it would not be very hard for

for him to get up such sworn testimony. The difficulty seems to be to tell what they would not swear to, against the life of a prophet of God, and his followers. I notice that one of the men whose "sworn testimony" he says he has, is Moses Smith, brother to Aaron. No man ever died stronger in the faith of any man as a prophet of God, than Moses Smith did in faith of James. (See Gospel Herald, vol. 4, No. 13.) As Mr. Scott has been found before in the business of forging names to give currency and force to his slanders against Mr. Strang, and others, we are about as much inclined to confide in his "sworn testimonies" as we have been in those collected by Dr. Hulbert and a number of others, against Joseph and the Book of Mormon, and cannot but think that Isaac is now in his old pursuit.

The Gurleyite or Josephite leaders when defending the character of old Joseph, have a very convenient way of sweeping away all objections somewhat after the following:

"Supposing that the prophet Joseph did do this, or did do that, did you ever think how much better he was, judged from your standpoint, than many of the prophets of old? Abraham denied his wife, Jacob had four wives, Moses slew a man and hid him in the sand, Samuel hewed a prisoner of war in pieces with a sword, David had many wives; and took his neighbor's wife and put her husband in the forefront of the battle so he could get slain, and Peter cut a man's ear off in aiming to cut off his head. Joseph never did anything of

this kind they say, and thus they go on seemingly forgetful that the very arguments they use to vindicate Joseph will vindicate James also. What if James should have sent out a body of armed men to a certain quarter of the country to kill all the males and save alive none but the young women; and when they returned with some old women and male children, command his men to kill them and tell them the Lord had commanded them to save only the young women who had not known man by lying with them, for themselves, how the pseudo leaders of the Reorganization would howl, to be sure!! Yet Moses was never accused of God as a criminal, and is now a ministering angel in company with Elijah, and neither Jesus nor Joseph objected to his ministration, but on the contrary praised God for it. Now sum up your "great covenants," and your "Charley Douglas" stories, and your "phosphorous and oil" stories, and all the rest of the stories, and allowing that they were all true which they are far from being; judged by the Reorganized standard there was nothing in the life of James that would anywhere equal or compare with the acts of Moses, and yet he is an archangel now, and throughout the whole code of divine things he was always regarded as a mighty prophet in the full approbation of God.

Mr. Scott says that the characters written on the Voree plates were written after the style of the characters found on the plates in Kinderhook, Pike county, Illinois. Anyone who



can see any likeness between the characters on the Voree plates and those of Kinderhook, must have a faculty for seeing, that I confess I have not. The Dutch alphabet is nearer like the English than these characters are one to the other. And the Chinese could not be farther off in form from the English than the Kinderhook characters are from those of the Voree plates. Besides the one are in perpendicular lines, and the other are in horizontal lines.

While Isaac Scott manifests a very decided talent for lying, he does not seem to have the necessary caution to make lying a complete success; but then he knows very well that one need not be very careful in lying against the prophets of God.

He says the letter of appointment is not written in Joseph Smith's language. We always thought that revelation was written in such language as God chose and not what man chooses. A pretty judge he is of what Joseph said at one time and at another.

And the letter of appointment he says is not in Joseph Smith's handwriting. Well it is certainly not in James,' and it is certain it came from Nauvoo, and it is certain that it has the Nauvoo postmark upon it, and it is certain that it came in answer to one James sent; as much so as any other letter ever came in answer to one sent under any circumstances. It is certain that Joseph Smith in connection with Hyrum and Sidney Rigdon requested James before he left Nauvoo to write them a general description of the land in the

vicinity of Burlington, Wis., in order that he might learn what facilities these lands offered for a settlement of the saints; and it is certain that James on his return there wrote such a description according to that request. Having made a thorough examination of the lands there, and the health of the climate, the goodness of the soil, the water, and the peaceable character of the inhabitants, cheapness of land, timber, stone, and general accessibility, he wrote the description thereof, and finding it offered every inducement for settlement, he felt earnestly to recommend those lands as a good home for the saints. And it is also certain that it was in answer to this letter from James that Joseph wrote the said letter of appointment. William Smith, John E. Page and others have put it on record that Emma Smith told them that a letter had been received by Joseph Smith from James J. Strang about the time of the date of said letter of appointment, and that she heard Joseph make use of the expression found at the opening of the letter of appointment.

William Smith says that on his return to Nauvoo soon after Joseph's death, having heard of Mr. Strang's appointment: "I called in to see sister Emma to inquire concerning the appointment. Sister Emma says that Joseph received a letter from Mr. Strang. Hyrum was present, and he called in John P. Green; at first Joseph thought all was not right, but Hyrum thought otherwise. They talked over matters a while and came to the conclusion that Joseph would

write a letter; so Joseph and brother Green went out for that purpose."

Now in relation to the "phosphorus and oil illumination," we would like to be able here to insert Mr. Strang's arguments in relation to that most atrocious and diabolical story, for diabolical it is, as clearly as anything that ever went down to the regions of the damned, but cannot till another time. When men fall from grace by their wicked deeds, and suddenly, on that account lose the Spirit and deny the faith, they need something as an excuse for so suddenly turning to destroy that which they have so earnestly, consistently and faithfully labored to build up; and *they* understand very well that the unpopularity of the prophets of God in this generation, affords them a very good scape goat for all their sins. Hence the "Spaulding story," by Dr. Hulbert; the "Expose" by John C. Bennett; the imprisonment of Joseph and Hyrum in Missouri by the plausible testimonies of various leading Mormons in that state, among whom were William E. McLellan, W. W. Phelps, David Whitmer, and the Cowderys, and others. And the same is true of many in James' day. Among the latter William Smith, Amos B. Fuller, Aaron Smith, Duty Griffith, John Gaylord, Isaac Scott, George J. Adams, Samuel P. Bacon, Samuel Graham, and others. It is a little curious that at the very time when William Smith stands charged with adultery, by several witnesses, and he refuses to appear for trial after being notified, he is found exceedingly in-

dustrious in circulating the "phosphorus and oil" story and lecturing against James J. Strang as an impostor! And it is equally interesting too that, some of those men who Isaac Scott tells us were "among the best men who ever walked in Voree," were witnesses there *against him* for "*duplicity, schism, heresy, and believing* the Presidency and officers of the church," They are A. B. Fuller, John McDougal, Daniel Avery. He like William Smith did not appear in court for trial, when notified. So "the charges of lying and duplicity, (double dealing) being clearly proved against him, he was cut off from the church and delivered over to the buffetings of Satan until he makes restitution." John C. Gaylord, who Isaac Scott tells us was one of these best men of Voree, was the President of the High Council, who decided his guilt, and cast him out of the church. (Voree Record, pages 122, 123).

The following also over the signature of John Greenhow I find in Zion's Reveille, page 20.

"Many of the pseudoes have openly avowed themselves infidels, and indulged in profanity and acts of depravity. Those of them who pretend to hold on to the apostate or pseudo organization, bolstered up their false and vindictive statements by the most barefaced forgeries, and an organized system of unprecedented frauds and impostures. \* \* \* \* Such men as William E. McLellan, Colins Pemberton, and Isaac Scott, whose repeated apostasies have rendered them so notorious, and whose

acts of perfidy have placed them in so unenviable a light in public estimation, wherever their baseness and unchristian deportment are known, should be held up to public scorn and contempt by all good men."

JOHN GREENHOW.

George J. Adams, whose conduct Mr. Chauncy Loomis tries to put such an innocent face on, in 1851 brought a woman of ill repute onto Beaver Island, passed her off as his wife, stating that his former wife was dead and he had married again. Soon after, Mr. Strang received a letter from Adams' wife inquiring of him if he knew George's whereabouts. Adams was then brought under the discipline of the church, his office and membership taken from him, and the outcome was one of the most remarkable persecutions in the history of the Latter Day Saints. He and his so-called wife left the Island breathing out the direst vengeance on the inhabitants of Beaver and Mr. Strang in particular. At Mackinaw Adams and wife swore Mr. Strang threatened their lives, and they had to flee to save their lives; and such swearing as was often had in Missouri at Mormon trials was the order of the proceedings against Mr. Strang. Have you forgotten these things Mr. Loomis? Suffice it to say that law, justice and equity were so outraged at the trial of Mr. Strang, as to be a disgrace to the very name of law and justice. At this gross outrage,—we will not call it a trial,—Mr. Strang was imprisoned *four* different times for barely objecting to some of its proceedings. These things are

all on record, and in time will be laid before the honest in heart.

As to Samuel P. Bacon, and Samuel Graham; "What about these two men so suddenly turning against Mr. Strang and the faith they had so long upheld and defended?" I will answer this question by asking some others. What about David Whitmer when he stepped aside from Joseph, and his claim that nearly the whole of the Doctrine and Covenants is an imposition? What about the fall of Thomas B. Marsh? What about the fall of William Law? What about Luke Johnson, William E. McLellan, and we might name a large number of others who at one time and another have dropped off for one cause and another. These all managed to make out that Joseph fell in some way *just about the time they had fallen themselves*. So you see that both Joseph and James had a good many falls, in their lives and ministry.

Chauncy Loomis and his brethren seem to carry the idea that because the church at Nauvoo was rejected with their dead, therefore nobody else in this generation until a temple is built can have baptism for the dead. Because one people fails no one else can have the favor and blessings of God. Therefore baptism for the dead at Voree and Beaver Island were all unlawful. This is in very good keeping with their many other follies and lies. The Josephites rely greatly upon the gifts; no matter how rotten the foundation upon which their church rests, if only they have the gifts among the members, that is everything; and they imagine



that all must be right. It has puzzled me much to know that these gifts are had among all the Mormon sects: Brighamites, Josephites, Whitmerites, and Strangites, according to the faith and desires of those who are honest among them. It is common to find both among Josephites and Brighamites, men who are ready to say "I *know* by the gift and power of God that Brigham," or Joseph, as the case may be, "is a prophet, seer, revelator, and successor to Joseph Smith," etc. And "I *know* by the gift and power of God" that this and that is true, etc. In these cases, and in all such cases, the Law and the testimony of God through his *chosen* and *anointed prophets*, is the only safe guide. As God, and Christ and his church are not divided, and God is not the author of confusion, the only safe guide in all things of this kind is to inquire first, very carefully, what the law of God is, under which prophets are made, and having found this, our next inquiry should be, *who* has been called and anointed to fill this office according to this law. For it is the rule in all governments, God's as well as man's, that the successor must come into office by the same law, rule and power that made his predecessor.

Next thing then, find out who has been clothed with authority under his administration, and who have been cast out as rebels and schismatics. Uphold the former in their proper places and reject and disregard the latter altogether. As in Joseph's day so in James'; every now and then there was somebody start-

ing out in rebellion and rejecting him for some one thing or another which he had revealed and brought to light; it is sufficient to say that when God sets up a prophet His eye is on him from that moment to the end of his ministry; and if there is any cause for removing him God will first declare it to that prophet himself. And until he does declare it through that prophet, no man has any right to reject that prophet unless he wishes to forfeit his own salvation. The blindest can see that as this prophet is the only authorized revelator to the whole people, and as his standing before God is a matter that concerns the whole people, and they are utterly forbidden to receive revelations from any other for their government, to hearken to this upstart, and that madman, and this self constituted revelator, and that tomfool, is simply to break the whole church of God in pieces, and bring all to one common ruin and destruction. For if one unauthorized man may rise up and give revelation to the church, another may, and another, and still another, till like the sects there will be nothing but confusion and anarchy everywhere; then the faith of men is lost in all, and wickedness of all kinds succeeds wickedness, until all meet in destruction and death together. The Reorganization has been produced in this way. And in fact so have all organized rebellions against God in all the prophetic ages. A few disaffected men setting themselves up as the proper standard as to what God should reveal and what he should not reveal, and to

determine when the prophet had fallen, instead of waiting for God to reveal that matter, or even asking for a reason for it, depart out and set up "a Reorganization" for themselves. Then we have a batch of lying and unauthorized revelations and commandments; and a president is awaiting. Who will it be? A son of the prophet Joseph. Apostates and pseudoes have already turned his mother against the prophet, and she disaffects her son, and when the delegates from the Reorganized church come to *persuade him that he is heir to the prophetic office*, they find him already empty, swept and garnished. "The Spirit" (?) then "manifests" and "reveals" wonders to those who have already rejected the truly anointed shepherd of God's flock. Yes, you can hear what "*the spirit said*," and "told me" on all sides, and the law and the testimony is either no where, or else is so grossly perverted as to be equal to no law at all.

Thus we have now a new home-made, man-made church, "just as good as any other set of *men* can make;" and having a son of the prophet for its head, nothing could be more likely to be correct on earth. These men seem to have entirely forgotten, or else never learned, that when a man turns away from, or rejects, a prophet of God, and goes then to seek for revelation, that he is as certain to be deceived as the sun to rise. He can no more avoid being deluded and deceived than he can change or abolish the laws of light. In all the cases on record of men rejecting a prophet of God, did you ever know it to fail?

"Rebel not against my servant Joseph," is the voice of God to the church by him. "Rebel not against my servant James" is the voice of God to those under James, and to this is added "They that are of the flock hear his voice; if not, they go astray to destruction." It matters not who they are. We very sincerely hope that Mr. Isaac Scott, and Mr. Chauncey Loomis will keep right on slandering Mr. Strang and his ministry, and that Mr. W. W. Blair will through *The Saints Herald* keep recommending these gentlemen as reliable witnesses against him.

Will defaming some one else as a false prophet, prove *your* leaders true? Supposing for instance that James J. Strang were already proven and set aside as an impostor, are you ready to test your prophet by the law and testimony of God? *We dare the best of you to do it.* Young Josephism, or more properly, Briggs and Gurleyism, looks very beautiful and attractive on the surface, but underneath it is fraud and deceit,—"*full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness.*" (Math. 23:27.)

Strangism looks indeed the very worst on the surface; but the deeper you go into its investigation, the more excellent, sound, and logical you find it. We have not room here for a thorough examination, but those who seek will find. Strangism is now the least but it will be the greatest of all by and by.

Neither the Brigamite leaders nor the leaders of the Josephites have ever once showed any willingness to discuss in a fair, manly, public way, the claims made by them for young Joseph to the prophetic office, with any leading Strangite. They always dodge that some way, and no doubt they always will. I want no man as my prophet who dares not test his own claims.

*February, 1889.*



do better than they did do if it was as the Reorganized leaders say it was? For they say first that "the church had forfeited all right and title to a prophet;" and again they say that "God commanded *them* to rise up and cast off *all* that claimed to be prophets, and to say that God *will raise* up a prophet to lead his people," etc. Thus while they claim that God appointed young Joseph, through his father, they in the next breath deny the fact, by saying that God "*will raise up*" one, and go to work *by command* of God (?) to cast all off who had claimed to be prophets. James J. Strang once said of Charles B. Thompsonism that it was so gross a bundle of contradictions, it required great forgetfulness on the part of its votaries, lest they apostatized from one paragraph of it while they read the next. This was unquestionably true, but no truer of that ism than of the Reorganization, as any one who investigates may see for himself. Reader, imagine yourself standing in Nauvoo for at least two years after the death of Joseph Smith. Here are men in all directions honestly inquiring who Joseph had appointed to lead the people. The wolves prowl around by day and devour by night, without any prophet or shepherd to warn, guide, or protect their prey from being swallowed up. Young Joseph, we are told at one end of a discourse, was *appointed* and *anointed* to stand in his father's stead, but he quietly looks on at the destruction and devouring of the flock of God, by the most rapacious wolves for full sixteen years, and has not only not a

word of warning to offer them, but is during all this terrible period as unconscious as a babe of any calling to *any* position as an officer in the church! In heavens name, we ask again, if God has raised up no prophet, as you inform us at the other end of your tongues, Why blame Brigham and his colleagues for misleading the church? *Could they do any better than they did do*, in the premises? O yes, they were so wicked at the death of Joseph that they "had forfeited all right and title to a prophet to lead them," but some 18 to 20 years afterward, when their wickedness and wrongdoing are twenty-fold completed, confirmed and strengthened, then we think they are fully deserving of the warning voice of a prophet to lead them!!

4. And now we are very gravely told that young Joseph is the only man among all that have arisen as leaders, who teaches the law of the Lord in all things, while all the others have violated and utterly disregarded it. There is not one word of truth in this statement; for not only are they false in the various directions as shown in The Diamond and the three different Prophetic Controversies, but so far as the gathering of the saints to places which God has appointed, and most strictly commanded them to gather to, it is impossible they could be further off from anything commanded; for instead of enjoining the gathering upon their new converts, at of the first importance, as God has made it, they enjoin nothing of the kind, but as earnestly seek to build churches right



among the wicked, as sectarians do. (Doc. & Cov., sec. 42, par. 18; sec. 45, 12; 57, 1; 63, 9; 98, 13.)

5. Baptism for the dead is a point of doctrine that, Joseph tells us, is so important in itself that we, without our dead, cannot be made perfect, nor can they without us. (See Joseph's two letters on Baptism for the Dead, Doc. & Cov., p. 327, par. 18.) Yet in the Reorganization it has never been practiced; and if it were, what good would it do, after rejecting the anointed prophet of God? "Whenever the Jews began to reject their prophets, they became defiled before God, and began to ripen rapidly for destruction. Had they continued to acknowledge their prophets, they never would have crucified their Messiah, and they would have escaped all the calamities that befell them." (Joseph Smith, Evening and Morning Star, June, 1834.) If both Brighamites and Josephites, the leading men of them, have not rejected a prophet of God in rejecting James J. Strang, there never was a prophet of God, rejected by any people since the days of Adam. Again, if the facts and arguments in Mr. Strang's favor are not reliable or satisfactory, what becomes of the arguments put forth in either Brigham's or young Joseph's behalf? No prophet of God ever put forth stronger arguments in behalf of his own claims than those put forth by Mr. Strang in behalf of his calling. If there is any stronger on record, where is it?

6. Whenever any man rejects a prophet of God whose claims and calling are put beyond a reasonable doubt, or objection, it matters not how great the manifestations of God may have been to him in the past, or what manifestations may be made to him afterwards, they will all only amount to a strong delusion to him.

7. The evidence of the claims and calling of Mr. James J. Strang, as a prophet of God, and successor to Joseph Smith, put forth by himself

and others in defence of that calling, is simply placed beyond reasonable doubt, or successful controversy; and these things are placed before all men as a matter of everlasting life or death. This is the decree of God, and the testimony of all his prophets.

8. Of all the prophets which God has raised up, since the world began, to lead his people, there is not a single case on record known, where one has so far transgressed as to lose either his Priesthood, or to put anything on record as the word of God which God has not spoken. Even Balaam, though a corrupt man and but a Patriarch over a single tribe of people, dare not put one word on record but what God gave him, though great riches and honors were placed before him as a temptation. Yet men of Reorganized proclivities are always ready on the shortest notice to reject both the prophets of God, and the word of God, if it does not happen to meet their approval. Instead of bringing their feelings and prejudices into subjection to the things revealed by the prophets of God, and his law, all things revealed must conform to their views and notions, or else they are going to get up a "Reorganization," and "vote" and "resolve," both law and prophets out of the Kingdom of God. Poor fools! They seem not to know that in doing so, they merely vote and resolve *themselves out of the Kingdom of God and into the dominion of Satan*. Supposing that such men cast out devils, speak in tongues, or even remove mountains; what will all their works avail in the day of righteous judgment? Just this: That they have used these things to lead men from the rock of revelation, and the law of the Almighty. Hence the righteousness of sending them to their own place as "workers of iniquity" who have not known the Almighty. (Math. 7: 22, 23. Deut. 17: 2-7, 13: 1-5.)

W. W.